THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS A Safe way to Salvation.

OR,

An ANSWER to a Book Entituled *Mercy and Truth*, or, *Charity maintain'd by Catholiques*: Which pretends to prove the Contrary.

To which is Added in this Third Impreſſion

The Apoſtolical Inſtitution of Epiſcopacy.

AS ALSO,

IX. SERMONS,

The *Firſt* Preached before His Majeſty King *CHARLES* the Firſt, the other *Eight* upon ſpecial and eminent Occaſions.

BY

William Chillingworth

Maſter of Arts of the Univerſity of OXFORD.

Iſaac. Caſaubon. *in Epiſt. ad Card.* Perron. *Regis* JACOBI *nomine ſcriptâ.*

Rex arbitratur, rerum abſolutè neceſſariarum ad ſalutem, non magnum eſſe numerum. Quare exiſtimat ejus Majeſtas, nullam ad ineundam concordiam breviorem viam fore, quàm ſi diligenter, ſeparentur neceſſaria à non neceſſariis, & ut de neceſſariis conveniat, omnis opera inſumatur: in non neceſſariis libertati Chriſtianæ locus detur. Simpliciter neceſſaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expreſsè verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendave, vel ex verbo Dei neceſſariâ conſequentiâ vetus Eccleſia elicuit. — Si ad decidendas hodiernas Controverſias hæc diſtinctio adhiberetur, & jus divinum à poſitivo ſeu Eccleſiaſtico candidè ſepararetur; non videtur de iis quæ ſunt abſolutè neceſſaria, inter pios & moderatos viros, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa ſunt, ut modò dicebamus, & ferè ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui ſe Chriſtianos dici poſtulant. Atq; iſtam diſtinctionem Sereniſſ. Rex tanti putat eſſe momenti ad minuendas Controverſias, quæ hodiè Eccleſiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis ſtudioſorum judicet officium eſſe, diligentiſſimè hanc explicare, docere, urgere.

LONDON:

Printed by *E. Cotes*, for *Thomas Thornicroft* at the ſign of the *Eagle and Child* in St. *Pauls* Church-yard near the little North-door. *M. DC. LXIV.*

THE RELIGION OF A SAVIOUR.

OR

A Safe Way to Salvation.

BODLEIAN
27.4.1903
LIBRARY

TO THE

Moſt HIGH and MIGHTY PRINCE,

CHALES

By the Grace of God, KING of *Great-Britain*, *France* and *Ireland*, Defendor of the Faith, &c.

May it pleaſe your moſt Excellent Majeſty,

I Preſent with all humility, to Your moſt Sacred hands, a Defence of that Cauſe which is and ought to be infinitely dearer to you, than all the World: Not doubting but upon this Dedication I ſhall be cenſured for a double boldneſs; both for undertaking ſo great a Work, ſo far beyond my weak abilities; and again, for preſenting it to ſuch a Patron, whoſe judgement I ought to fear more than any Adverſary. But for the firſt, it is a ſatisfaction to my ſelf, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain opinion of my ſelf, (whoſe perſonal defects are the only thing which I preſume to know,) but undertook it in obedience to Him who ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres*, not to St. *Peter* only, but to all men: being encouraged alſo to it by the goodneſs of the Cauſe, which is able to make

a weak man ſtrong. To the belief hereof I was not led partially or by chance, as many are, by the prejudice and prepoſſeſſion of their Country, Education, and ſuch like inducements; which if they lead to Truth in one place, perhaps lead to Error in a hundred; but having with the greateſt equality and indifferency, made enquiry and grounds on both Sides, I was willing to impart to others, that ſatisfaction which was given to my ſelf. For my inſcribing to it Your Majeſties Sacred Name, I ſhould labour much in my excuſe of it from high preſumption, had it not ſome appearance of Title to your Majeſties Patronage and protection, as being a Defence of that Book, which by ſpecial order from Your Majeſty was written ſome years ſince, chiefly for the general good, but peradventure not without ſome aime at the recovery of One of Your meaneſt Subjects from dangerous deviation; and ſo due unto Your Majeſty, as the fruit of Your own High Humility and moſt Royal Charity. Beſides, it is in a manner nothing elſe, but a purſuance of, and a ſuperſtruction upon that bleſſed Doctrine, wherewith I have adorned and armed the Frontiſpice of my Book, which was ſo earneſtly recommended to Your Royal Father of happy memory, to all the lovers of Truth and Peace; that is, to all that were like Himſelf, as the only hopeful means of healing the Breaches of Chriſtendome, whereof the Enemy of ſouls makes ſuch peſtilent advantage. The luſtre of this bleſſed Doctrine I have endeavoured

to

to uncloud and unvail, and to free it from thoſe miſts and fumes which have been raiſed to obſcure it, by one of that Order, which envenomes even poiſon it ſelf, and makes the *Roman* Religion much more malignant and turbulent than otherwiſe it would be: whoſe very Rule and Doctrine, obliges them to make all men, as much as lies in them, ſubjects unto Kings, and ſervants unto Chriſt, no farther than it ſhall pleaſe the Pope. So that whether Your Majeſty be conſidered, either as a Pious Son towards Your Royall Father King *James*, or as a tender hearted and compaſſionate Son towards Your diſtreſſed Mother, the Catholique Church, or as a King of Your Subjects, or as a Servant unto Chriſt, this Work, (to which I can give no other commendation, but that it was intended to do You ſervice in all theſe capacities,) may pretend, not unreaſonably, to Your Gracious acceptance. Laſtly, being a Defence of that whole Church and Religion You profeſs, it could not be ſo proper to any Patron as to the great Defendor of it; which ſtyle Your Majeſty hath ever ſo exactly made good, both in ſecuring it from all dangers, and in vindicating it (by the well ordering and rectifying this Church) from all the foul aſperſions both of Domeſtick and Foraign enemies, of which they can have no ground, but their own want of Judgement, or want of Charity. But it is an argument of a deſpairing and loſt cauſe to ſupport it ſelf with theſe impetuous out-cries and clamours, the faint refuges of thoſe that want better arguments;

ments; like that Stoick in *Lucian* that cryed *Ὦ πονηρὲ!* *O damned villain!* when he could ſay nothing elſe. Neither is it credible the wiſer ſort of them ſhould believe this their own horrid aſſertion, That a God of goodneſs ſhould damn to eternal torments, thoſe that love him and love truth, for errors which they fall into through humane frailty! But this they muſt ſay, otherwiſe their only great argument from their damning us, and our not being ſo peremtory in damning them, becauſe we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuſe them, would be loſt: and therefore they are engaged to act on this Tragical part, only to fright the ſimple and ignorant, as we do little children, by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truely that herein they do but act a part, and know themſelves to do ſo, and deal with us here, as they do with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurſe and Excommunicate for faſhion'ſake on *Maundy-Thurſday*, for detaining part of St. *Peters* Patrimony, and abſolve him without ſatisfaction on *Good-Friday*; methinks their faltring and inconſtancy herein, makes it very apparent: For though for the moſt part, they ſpeak nothing but thunder and lightning to us, and damn us all without mercy or exception; yet ſometimes to ſerve other purpoſes, they can be content to ſpeak to us in a milder ſtrain, and tell us, as my Adverſary does more than once, *That they allow Proteſtants as much Charity as Proteſtants allow them.* Neither is this the only contradiction which I have diſcovered

red in this uncharitable Work; but have ſhewed that by forgetting himſelf, and retracting moſt of the principal grounds he builds upon, he hath ſaved me the labour of a Confutation: which yet I have not in any place found any ſuch labour or difficulty, but that it was undertakable by a man of very mean, that is, of my abilities. And the reaſon is, becauſe it is Truth I plead for; which is ſo ſtrong an argument for it ſelf, that it needs only light to diſcover it; whereas it concernes Falſhood and Error to uſe diſguiſes and ſhadowings, and all the fetches of Art and Sophiſtry; and therefore it ſtands in need of abler men, to give that a colour at leaſt, which hath no real body to ſubſiſt by. If my endeavours in this kind may contribute any thing to this diſcovery, and the making plain that Truth (which my Charity perſwades me the moſt part of them diſaffect, only becauſe it hath not been well repreſented to them,) I have the fruit of my labour, and my wiſh, who deſire to live to no other end, than to do ſervice to Gods Church, and Your moſt Sacred Majeſty, in the quality of

Your MAJESTIES

Moſt faithful Subject,

and moſt humble

and devoted Servant

William Chillingworth.

The CONTENTS of the Chapters, with the Anſwers thereunto.

THE Author of Charity Maintained, *his Preface to the Reader,* Page 1.
The Anſwer to the Preface, 5.

The FIRST PART.

CHAP. I.

THE State of the Queſtion; with a ſummary of the Reaſons for which, men of different Religions, one ſide only can be ſaved, Page 23.

The Anſwer to the Firſt Chapter.

Shewing, that the Adverſary grants the Former Queſtion, and propoſeth a New One: And that there is no reaſon, why among men of different Opinions and Communions, one Side only can be ſaved, 25

CHAP. II.

What is that means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our underſtanding, and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion, 37

The Anſwer to the Second Chapter.

Concerning the means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our Underſtanding; and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion, 45

CHAP. III.

That the diſtinction of Points Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is neither pertinent, nor true in our preſent Controverſie: And that the Catholique viſible Church cannot err, in either kind of the ſaid Point,* 107

The Anſwer to the Third Chapter.

Wherein is maintained, That the diſtinction of Points Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholique Church may err in the latter kind of the ſaid Points,* 115

CHAP.

Chap. IV.

To ſay, that the Creed contains all Points neceſſary to be believed, is neither pertinent *to the Queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelf* true, 165

The Anſwer to the Fourth Chapter.

Wherein is ſhewed, that the Creed contains all neceſſary Points of meer belief, 172

Chap. V.

That Luther, Calvin, *their Aſſociates, and all who began or continue the Separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formal ſin of Schiſm,* 210

The Anſwer to the Fifth Chapter.

The ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Roman Church, being upon juſt and neceſſary cauſes, is not any way guilty of Schiſm, 227

Chap. VI.

That Luther *and the reſt of the Proteſtants have added Hereſie unto Schiſm,* 279

The Anſwer unto the Sixth Chapter.

That Proteſtants are not Heretiques, 289

Chap. VII.

In regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones ſelf, Proteſtants are in a ſtate of Sin, as long as they remain ſeparate from the Roman-*Church,* 341

The Anſwer to the Seventh Chapter.

That Proteſtants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themſelves, to re-unite themſelves to the Roman-*Church,* 345

The Concluſion, 365

The

THE PREFACE

To the AUTHOR of *CHARITY MAINTAINED:* WITH An Answer to his Pamphlet, entituled *A Direction to N. N.*

SIR,

UPon the first news of the publication of your Book, I used all diligence, with speed to procure it; and came with such a mind to the reading of it, as S. *Austin*, before he was a setled Catholique, brought to his conference with *Faustus* the Manichee. For, as he thought that if any thing more than ordinary might be said in defence of the Manichean Doctrine, *Faustus* was the man from whom it was to be expected: So my perswasion concerning you was, -- *Si Pergama dextrâ Defendi possunt, certè hac defensa videbo.* For I conceived that among the Champions of the Roman Church, the English in reason must be the best, or equall to the best, as being by most expert Masters trained up purposely for this war, and perpetually practised in it. Among the English, I saw the Jesuites would yield the first place to none; and men so wise in their generation as the Jesuits were, if they had any *Achilles* among them, I presumed, would make choice of him for this service. And besides, I had good assurance that in the framing of this building, though you were the only Architect, yet you wanted not the assistance of many diligent hands to bring you in choise materials towards it; nor of many careful and watchful eyes, to correct the errors of your Work, if any should chance to escape you. Great reason therefore had I to expect great matters from you, and that your Book should have in it the Spirit and Elixir of all that can be said in defence of your Church and Doctrine; and to assure my self, that if my resolution not to believe it, were not built upon the rock of evident grounds and reasons, but only upon some sandy and deceitful appearances, now the wind and storm and floods were coming, which would undoubtedly overthrow it.

2. Neither truly were you more willing to effect such an alteration in me, then I was to have it effected. For my desire is to go the right way to *eternal happiness*. But whether this way lie on the right hand or the left, or straight forwards; whether it be by following a living Guide, or by seeking my direction in a Book, or by hearkning to the secret whisper of some private Spirit, to me it is indifferent. And he that is otherwise affected, and hath not a travellers indifference, which *Epictetus* requires in all that would find the truth, but much desires in respect of his ease, or pleasure, or profit, or advancement, or satisfaction of friends, or any humane

consideration, that one way should be true rather than another; it is odds but he will take his desire that it should be so, for an assurance that it is so. But, I for my part, unless I deceive my self, was, and still am so affected, as I have made profession, not willing I confess to take any thing upon trust, and to believe it without asking my self why; no, nor able to command my self (were I never so willing) to follow, like a sheep, every Shepherd that should take upon him to guide me; or every flock that should chance to go before me: but most apt and most willing to be led by reason to any way, or from it; and alwaies submitting all other reasons to this one, God hath said so, therefore it is true. Nor yet was I so unreasonable as to expect Mathematical demonstrations from you in matters plainly incapable of them, such as are to be believed, and, if we speak properly, cannot be known; such therefore I expected not. For, as he is an unreasonable Master, who requires a stronger assent to his conclusions then his arguments deserve; so I conceive him a froward and undisciplin'd Scholar, who desires stronger arguments for a conclusion than the Matter will bear. But, had you represented to my understanding such reasons of your Doctrine, as, being weighed in an eaven ballance, held by an eaven hand, with those on the other side, would have turned the scale, and have made your Religion more credible than the contrary; certainly, I should have despised the shame of one more alteration, and with both mine arms and all my heart most readily have embraced it. Such was my expectation from you, and such my preparation, which I brought with me to the reading of your Book.

3. Would you know now what the event was, what effect was wrought in me, by the perusal and consideration of it? To deal truly and ingenuously with you, I fell somewhat in my good opinion both of your sufficiency and sincerity: but was exceedingly confirmed in my ill opinion of the Cause maintained by you. I found every where snares that might entrap, and colours that might deceive the simple; but nothing that might perswade, and very little that might move [illegible] understanding man, and one that can discern between Discourse and [illegible]try. In short, I was verily perswaded that I plainly saw and could make it appear, to all dis-passionate and unprejudicate Judges, that a vein of sophistry and calumny did run clean thorow it from the beginning to the end. And letting some Friends understand so much, I suffered my self to be perswaded by them, that it would not be either unproper for me, nor unacceptable to God, nor peradventure altogether unserviceable to his Church, nor justly offensive to you (if you indeed were a lover of Truth, and not a maintainer of a Faction,) if setting aside the Second Part, which was in a manner wholly employed in particular disputes, repetitions and references, and in wranglings with D. *Potter* about the sense of some supernumerary quotations, and whereon the main question no way depends, I would make a fair and ingenuous answer to the First, wherein the substance of the present Controversie is confessedly contained; and which, if it were clearly answered, no man would desire any other answer to the Second. This therefore I undertook with a full resolution to be an adversary to your Errors, but a Friend and Servant to your Person: and so much the more a friend to your person, by how much the severer and more rigid adversary I was to your errors.

4. In this Work my conscience bears me witness that I have, according to your advice, *proceeded always with this consideration, that I am to give a*

most

most strict account of every line, and word, that passeth under my pen: and therefore have been precisely careful for the matter of my Book to defend truth only, and only by Truth. And then, scrupulously fearful of scandalizing you or any man with *the manner* of handling it. From this Rule, sure I am, I have not willingly swerved in either part of it; and, that I might not do it ignorantly, I have not only my self examined mine own Work, (perhaps with more severity than I have done yours, as conceiving it a base and unchristian thing to go about to satisfie others with what I my self am not fully satisfied;) but have also made it pass the fiery tryal of the exact censures of many understanding Judges, alwayes heartily wishing that you your Self had been of the *Quorum*. But they who did undergo this burthen, as they wanted not sufficiency to discover any heterodox Doctrine, so I am sure, they have been very careful to let nothing slip dissonant from truth or from the authorized Doctrine of the Church of *England*: and therefore whatsoever causeless or groundless jealousie, any man may entertain concerning my Person, yet my Book, I presume, in reason and common equity should be free from them; wherein I hope, that little or nothing hath escaped so many eyes, which being weighed in the balance of the Sanctuary, will be found too light. And in this hope I am much confirmed, by your strange carriage of your self in this whole business. For though by some crooked and sinister arts, you have got my Answer into your hands, now a year since and upwards, as I have been assured by some that profess to know it, and those of your own party; though you could not want every day fair opportunities of sending to me, and acquainting me with any Exceptions, which, you conceived, might be justly taken to it, or any part of it (than which nothing could have been more welcome to me) yet hitherto you have not been pleased to acquaint me with any one. Nay more, though you have been at sundry times, and by several wayes, entreated and sollicited, nay pressed and importuned by me, to joyn with me in a private discussion of the Controversie between us, before the publication of my Answer, (because I was extremely unwilling to publish any thing which had not passed all manner of tryals, as desiring not that I, or my Side, but that Truth might overcome on which Side soever it was;) though I have protested to you, and sent it under my hand, (which protestation by Gods help I would have made good) If you, or any other would undertake your Cause, would give me a fair meeting, and choose out of your whole Book any one argument, whereof you were most confident, and by which you would be content the rest should be judged of, and make it appear that I had not, or could not answer it, that I would desist from the work which I had undertaken, and answer none at all; though by all the Arts which possibly I could devise, I have provoked you to such a trial, in particular by assuring you that if you refused it, the World should be informed of your tergiversation: notwithstanding all this, you have perpetually, and obstinately declined it; which to my understanding is a very evident sign that there is not any truth in your Cause, nor (which is impossible there should be) strength in your Arguments, especially considering what our Saviour hath told us, *Every one that doth evill hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved; but he that doth truth, cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.*

5. In the mean while though you despaired of compassing your desire this honest way; yet you have not omitted to tempt me, by base and unworthy considerations, to desert the Cause which I had undertaken; letting me understand from you, by an Acquaintance common to us both, how that *in case my Work should come to light, my inconstancy in Religion* (so you miscal my constancy in following that way to heaven which for the present seems to me the most probable) *should be to my great shame painted to the life*; that *my own Writings should be produced against my self*; *that I should be urged to answer my own Motives against Protestantism, and that such things should be published to the World touching my belief,* (for my Painter I must expect should have great skill in Perspective) *of the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Saviour, and all supernaturall Verities, as should endanger all my Benefices present or future*: that *this warning was given me, not out of fear of what I could say (for that Catholiques if they might wish any ill would beg the Publication of my Book, for respects obvious enough,) but out of a meer charitable desire of my good and reputation*: and *that all this was said upon a supposition that I was answering, or had a mind to answer* Charity Maintain'd; *If not, no harm was done.* To which courteous Premonition, as I remember, I desired the Gentleman, who dealt between us, to return this Answer, or to this effect; That I believed the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Saviour, and all other supernatural Verities revealed in Scripture, as truly and as heartily as your self, or any man, and therefore herein your *Charity* was very much *mistaken*; but much more and more uncharitably in conceiving me a man that was to be wrought upon with these *Terribiles visu forma*, those carnal and base fears which you presented to me, which were very proper motives for the Devil and his instruments to tempt poor-spirited men out of the way of conscience and honesty, but very incongruous, either for Teachers of Truth to make use of, or for Lovers of Truth (in which Company I had been long ago matriculated) to hearken to, with any regard. But if you were indeed desirous that I should not answer *Charity Maintain'd*, one way there was, and but one, whereby you might obtain your desire; and that was, by letting me know, when and where I might attend you, and by a fair conference, to be written down on both sides, convincing mine understanding (who was resolved not to be a *Recusant* if I were *convicted*,) that any one part of it, any one Argument in it, which was of moment and consequence, and whereon the cause depends, was indeed unanswerable. This was the effect of my Answer, which I am well assured was delivered: but Reply from you I received none but this, That you would have no conference with me but in Print; and soon after finding me of proof against all these batteries, and thereby (I fear) very much enraged, you took up the resolution of the furious Goddess in the Poet, madded with the unsuccessfulness of her malice,

Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo!

6. For certainly, those indigne contumelies, that masse of portentous and execrable calumnies, wherewith in your Pamphlet of *Directions to N. N.* you have loaded not only my Person in particular, but all the learned and moderate Divines of the Church of *England*, and all Protestants in general, nay all wise men of all Religions but your own, could not proceed from any other fountain.

7. To

7. To begin with the laſt: You ſtick not in the beginning of your firſt Chapter, to faſten the imputation *of Atheiſm and Irreligion upon all wiſe and gallant men, that are not of your own Religion.* In which uncharitable and unchriſtian judgment, void of all colour or ſhadow of probability, I know yet by experience, that very many of the *Bigots* of your Faction, are partakers with you. God forbid I ſhould think the like of you! Yet, if I ſhould ſay, that in your Religion there want not ſome temptations unto, and ſome Principles of, Irreligion and Atheiſm; I am ſure I could make my aſſertion much more probable than you have done, or can make this horrible imputation.

8. For to paſs by, *Firſt*, that which experience juſtifies, That where and when your Religion hath moſt abſolutely commanded, there and then Atheiſm hath moſt abounded: To ſay nothing, *Secondly*, of your notorious and confeſſed forging of ſo many falſe Miracles, and ſo many lying Legends, which is not unlikely to make ſuſpicious men to queſtion the truth of all: Nor to object to you, *Thirdly*, the abundance of your weak and ſilly Ceremonies, and ridiculous obſervances in your Religion; which, in all probability, cannot but beget ſecret contempt and ſcorn of it, in wiſe and conſidering men; and, conſequently, Atheiſm and Impiety, if they have this perſwaſion ſetled in them (which is too rife among you, and which you account a piece of *Wiſdome and Gallantry*) that if they be not of your Religion, they were as good be of none at all: Nor to trouble you, *Fourthly*, with this, that a great part of your Doctrine, eſpecially in the points conteſted, makes apparently for the temporal ends of the Teachers of it; which yet, I fear, is a great ſcandal to many *Beaux Eſprits* among you: Only I ſhould deſire you to conſider attentively, when you conclude ſo often from the Differences of Proteſtants, that they have no certainty of any part of their Religion, no not of thoſe points wherein they agree, Whether you do not that which ſo Magiſterially you direct me not to do, that is, proceed *a deſtructive way, and object arguments againſt your Adverſaries, which tend to the overthrow of all Religion?* And whether, as you argue thus, *Proteſtants differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing:* So, an Atheiſt or a Sceptique may not conclude as well, Chriſtians and the Profeſſors of all Religions differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty in any thing? Again, I ſhould deſire you to tell me ingenuouſly, Whether it be not too probable that your portentous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation joyned with your fore-mentioned perſwaſion of, *No Papiſts no Chriſtians*, hath brought a great many others, as well as himſelf, to *Averroes* his reſolution, *Quandoquidem Chriſtiani adorant quod comedunt, ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis?* Whether your requiring men upon only *probable* and *prudential Motives*, to yield a *moſt certain aſſent* unto things in humane reaſon impoſſible; and telling them, as you do too often, that they were as good not believe at all, as believe with any lower degree of faith; be not a likely way to make conſidering men ſcorn your Religion, (and conſequently all, if they know no other) as requiring things contradictory, and impoſſible to be performed? Laſtly, Whether your pretence that there is no good ground to believe Scripture, but your Churches infallibility, joyned with your pretending no ground for this but ſome texts of Scripture, be not a fair way to make them that underſtand themſelves, believe neither Church nor Scripture?

9. Your calumnies againſt Proteſtants in generall, are ſet down in theſe words, Chap. 2. §. 2. *The very doctrine of Proteſtants if it be followed cloſely, and with coherence to it ſelf, muſt of neceſſity induce* Socinianiſm. *This I ſay confidently, and evidently prove, by inſtancing in one error which may well be tearmed the Capital, and mother-Hereſie, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe; I mean, their hereſie in affirming, That the perpetual viſible Church of Chriſt, deſcended by a never interrupted ſucceſſion from our Saviour, to this day, is not infallible in all that it propoſeth to be believed, as revealed truths. For if the* infallibility *of ſuch a publique* Authority *be once impeached; what remains, but that every man is given over to his own* wit, *and* diſcourſe? *And talk not here of Holy Scripture. For if the true Church may erre, in defining what Scriptures be Canonicall; or in delivering the ſenſe and meaning thereof; we are ſtill devolved, either upon the* private ſpirit, (*a foolery now exploded out of* England, *which finally leaving every man to his own conceits, ends in* Socinianiſm); *or elſe upon natural wit, and judgement, for examining and determining, What Scriptures contain true or falſe doctrine, and in that reſpect, ought to be received, or rejected. And indeed, take away the authority of God's Church, no man can be aſſured, that any one Book, or parcel of Scripture, was written by divine inſpiration: or that all the contents, are infallibly true; which are the direct errors of* Socinians. *If it were but for this reaſon alone, no man, who regards the eternal ſalvation of his ſoul, would live or dye in* Proteſtancy, *from which ſo vaſt abſurdities as theſe of the* Socinians *muſt inevitably follow. And it ought to be an unſpeakable comfort to all us Catholiques, while we conſider, that none can deny the infallible authority of our Church, but joyntly he muſt be left to his own wit and wayes; and muſt abandon all* infuſed faith, *and true Religion, if he do but underſtand himſelf aright.* In all which diſcourſe, the only true word you ſpeak is, *This I ſay confidently.* As for *proving evidently*, that I believe you reſerved for ſome other opportunity: for the preſent, I am ſure you have been very ſparing of it.

10. You ſay, indeed confidently enough, that *The deny all of the Churches infallibility is the Mother-Hereſie, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe:* Which is ſo far from being a neceſſary truth, as you make it, that it is indeed a manifeſt falſhood. Neither is it poſſible for the wit of man, by any good, or ſo much as probable conſequence, from the denyal of the Churches Infallibility to deduce any one of the ancient Hereſies, or any one error of the *Socinians*, which are the Hereſies here entreated of. For who would not laugh at him that ſhould argue thus; Neither the Church of *Rome*, nor any other Church is infallible, *Ergo*, The doctrine of *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Eutyches*, *Neſtorius*, *Photinus*, *Manichæus*, was true Doctrine? On the other ſide, it may be truly ſaid and juſtified by very good and effectual reaſon, that he that affirms, with you, the Pope's infallibility, puts himſelf into his hands and power, to be led by him at his eaſe and pleaſure into all Hereſie, and even to Hell it ſelf; and cannot with reaſon ſay (ſo long as he is conſtant to his grounds) *Domine, cur ita facis?* but muſt believe *white to be black, and black to be white; vertue to be vice, and vice to be vertue*; nay (which is a horrible but a moſt certain truth) Chriſt to be Antichriſt, and Antichriſt to be Chriſt, if it be poſſible for the Pope to ſay ſo: Which, I ſay, and will maintain, howſoever you daub and diſguiſe it, is indeed to make men Apoſtate from Chriſt to his pretended

Vicar,

Vicar, but real Enemy. For that name and no better (if we may speak truth without offence) I presume He deserves, who under pretence of interpreting the Law of Christ, (which Authority without any word of express warrant he hath taken upon himself,) doth in many parts evacuate and dissolve it: So dethroning Christ from his dominion over mens consciences, and instead of Christ, setting up Himself; Inasmuch as he that requires that his interpretations of any Law should be obeyed as true and genuine, seem they to mens understandings never so dissonant and discordant from it, (as the Bishop of *Rome* does,) requires indeed that *his interpretations* should be the *Lawes*; and he that is firmly prepared in minde to believe and receive all such interpretations without judging of them, and though to his private judgement they seem unreasonable, is indeed congruously disposed to hold Adultery a venial sin, and Fornication no sin, whensoever the Pope and his Adherents shall so declare. And whatsoever he may plead, yet either wittingly or ignorantly, he makes the Law and the Law-maker both stales, and obeyes only the Interpreter. As if I should pretend that I should submit to the Lawes of the King of *England*, but should indeed resolve to obey them in that sense which the King of *France* should put upon them, whatsoever it were; I presume every understanding man would say, that I did indeed obey the King of *France*, and not the King of *England*. If I should pretend to believe the Bible, but that I would understand it according to the sense which the chief Mufty should put upon it, Who would not say that I were a Christian in pretense only, but indeed a *Mahumetan*?

11. Nor will it be to purpose for you to pretend that the Precepts of Christ are so plain that it cannot be feared, that any Pope should ever go about to dissolve them, and pretend to be a Christian: For, not to say that you now pretend the contrary, (to wit,) *that the law of Christ is obscure even in things necessary to be believed and done*, and by saying so, have made a fair way for any fowl interpretation of any part of it: certainly that which the Church of *Rome* hath already done in this kind, is an evident argument, that (if she once had this power unquestioned, and made expedite and ready for use, by being contracted to the Pope) she may do what she pleaseth with it. Who that had lived in the Primitive Church, would not have thought it as utterly improbable, that ever they should have brought in the worship of Images, and picturing of God as now it is, that they should legitimate Fornication? Why may we not think, they may in time take away the whole Communion from the Laity, as well as they have taken away half of it? Why may we not think that any Text and any Sense may not be accorded, as well as the whole 14. *Ch.* of the *Ep.* of S. *Paul* to the *Corinth.* is reconciled to the Latine-Service? How is it possible any thing should be plainer forbidden, than the *worship of Angels*, in the *Ep.* to the *Colossians*? than *the teaching for Doctrines mens commands* in the Gospel of S. *Mark*? And therefore seeing we see these things done, which hardly any man would have believed, that had not seen them, Why should we not fear that this unlimited power may not be used hereafter with as little moderation? Seeing devices have been invented how men may worship Images without Idolatry, and kill innocent men under pretence of Heresie without murder; Who knows that some tricks may not be hereafter devised, by which, Lying with other

mens

mens wives ſhall be no Adultery, taking away other mens goods no theft? I conclude therefore, That if *Solomon* himſelf were here, and were to determine the difference, Which is more likely to be mother of all Hereſie, The *denial* of the *Churches*, or the *affirming* of the *Popes Infallibility?* that he would certainly ſay, *This is the mother, give her the childe.*

12. You ſay again confidently, That *if this Infallibility be once impeached, every man is given over to his own wit and diſcourſe:* which, if you mean *diſcourſe*, not guiding it ſelf by Scripture, but only by principles of nature, or perhaps by prejudices and popular errors, and drawing conſequences, not by Rule, but Chance, is by no means true; if you mean, by Diſcourſe, right Reaſon, grounded on Divine Revelation and common Notions, written by God in the hearts of all men; and deducing, according to the never failing rules of Logick, conſequent deductions from them: If this be it which you mean by *diſcourſe*, it is very meet, and reaſonable, and neceſſary that men, as in all their actions, ſo eſpecially in that of greateſt importance, the choice of their way to happineſs, ſhould be left unto it: and he that follows this in all his opinions and actions, and does not only ſeem to do ſo, follows alwayes God; whereas he that followeth a Company of men, may oft-times follow a company of beaſts. And in ſaying this, I ſay no more than S. *John* to all Chriſtians in theſe words, *Dearly beloved, believe not every ſpirit; but try the ſpirits, whether they be of God, or no:* and the rule he gives them to make this tryal by, is, to conſider, Whether they *confeſs Jeſus to be Chriſt*; that is, the Guid of their Faith, and Lord of their Action; not, whether they acknowledge the Pope to be his Vicar: I ſay no more than S. *Paul*, in exhorting all Chriſtians, *To try all things, and hold faſt that which is good:* then S. *Peter* in commanding all Chriſtians, *To be ready to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them:* then *our Saviour* himſelf, in forewarning all his Followers, that *if they blindly followed blinde guides, both leaders and followers ſhould fall into the ditch:* and again, in ſaying even to the people, *Yea, and why of your ſelves judge yee not what is right?* And though by paſſion, or precipitation, or prejudice, by want of reaſon, or not uſing what they have, men may be, and are oftentimes, led into error and miſchief; yet, that they cannot be miſguided by *Diſcourſe*, truly ſo called, ſuch as I have deſcribed, you your ſelf have given them ſecurity. For, what is *Diſcourſe*, but drawing concluſions out of premiſes by good conſequence? Now, the Principles which we have ſetled, to wit, the *Scriptures*, are on all ſides agreed to be infallibly true. And you have told us in the fourth Chap. of this Pamphlet, That *from truth no man can, by good conſequence, infer falſhood*; Therefore, by *Diſcourſe*, no man can poſſibly be led to Error: but if he err in his Concluſions, he muſt of neceſſity, either err in his Principles, (which here cannot have place) or commit ſome error in his Diſcourſe; that is, indeed, not Diſcourſe, but ſeem to do ſo.

13. You ſay, Thirdly, with ſufficient confidence, That *if the true Church may erre in defining what Scriptures be Canonical, or in delivering the ſenſe thereof, then we muſt follow either the private Spirit, or elſe natural wit and judgment; and by them examine what Scriptures contain true or falſe Doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or rejected.* All which is apparently untrue, neither can any proof of it be pretended. For though the preſent Church may poſſibly err in her judgment touching this matter, yet have we other directions in it, beſides the private ſpirit, and the examination

tion of the contents, (which latter way may conclude the negative very ſtrongly, to wit, that ſuch or ſuch a Book cannot come from God, becauſe it contains irreconcileable Contradictions; but the Affirmative it cannot conclude, becauſe the contents of a Book may be all true, and yet the Book not written by Divine inſpiration:) other direction therefore I ſay we have, beſides either of theſe three, and that is, The teſtimony of the Primitive Chriſtians.

14. You ſay, Fourthly, with convenient boldneſs, That *this infallible Authority of your Church being denyed, no man can be aſſured, that any parcell of Scripture was written by Divine inſpiration:* Which is an untruth, for which no proof is pretended; and beſides, void of modeſty, and full of impiety. The firſt, becauſe the experience of innumerable Chriſtians is againſt it, who are ſufficiently aſſured, that the Scripture is divinely inſpired, and yet deny the infallible authority of your Church, or any other. The ſecond, becauſe if I have not ground to be aſſured of the Divine authority of Scripture, unleſs I firſt believe your Church infallible, than I can have no ground at all to believe it: becauſe there is no ground, nor can any be pretended, why I ſhould believe your Church *infallible*, unleſs I firſt believe the Scripture Divine.

15. Fiftly and laſtly, You ſay, with confidence in abundance, that *none can deny the infallible authority of your Church, but he muſt abandon all infuſed faith and true religion, if he do but underſtand himſelf:* Which is to ſay, agreeable to what you had ſaid before, and what out of the abundance of your heart you ſpeak very often, *That all Chriſtians beſides you, are open Fools, or concealed Atheiſts.* All this you ſay with notable confidence (as the maner of Sophiſters is, to place their confidence of prevailing in their confident maner of ſpeaking,) but then for the *evidence* you promiſed to maintain this confidence, that is quite vaniſhed and become invifible.

16. Had I a minde to recriminate now, and to charge Papiſts (as you do Proteſtants) that they lead men to Socinianiſm, I could certainly make a much fairer ſhew of evidence than you have done. For I would not tell you, You deny the infallibility of the Church of *England*; *ergo*, you lead to Socinianiſm, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this; Proteſtants deny the infallibility of the *Roman*-Church; *ergo*, they induce Socinianiſm: Nor would I reſume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the Popes infallibility, you ſubmit your ſelf to that Capital and Mother-Hereſie, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at eaſe to believe *vertue vice*, and *vice vertue*; to believe Antichriſtianity Chriſtianiſm, and Chriſtianity Antichriſtian; he may lead you to Socinianiſm, to Turciſm, nay to be Devill himſelf if he have a minde to it: But I would ſhew you that divers wayes the Doctors of your Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, undermining the Doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be ſupported by thoſe pillars of the Faith, which alone are fit and able to ſupport it, I mean Scripture, and the Conſent of the ancient Doctors.

17. For *Scripture*, your men deny very plainly and frequently, that this Doctrine can be proved by it. See, if you pleaſe, this plainly taught, and urged very earneſtly by Cardinal *Hoſius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip. l.* 3. *p.* 53. By *Gordonius Huntlæus*, *Contr. Tom.* 1. *Controv.* 1. *De verbo Dei C.* 19. by *Gretſerus* and *Tannerus*, *in Colloquio Ratiſbon.* And alſo by *Vega*, *Poſſevin*, *Wickus*, and *Others*.

18. And

18. And then for *the Conſent of the Ancients*; That that alſo delivers it not, by whom are we taught but by Papiſts only? Who is it that makes known to all the world, that *Euſebius* that great ſearcher and devourer of the Chriſtian Libraries *was an Arrian*? Is it not your great *Achilles, Cardinal Perron*, in his 3. Book 2. Chap. of his Reply to K. *James*? Who is it that informs us that *Origen* (who never was queſtioned for any error in this matter, in or neer his time) *denied the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt*? Is it not the ſame great Cardinal, in his Book of the *Euchariſt* againſt *M. du Pleſſis l. 2. c. 7*? Who is it that pretends that *Irenæus hath ſaid thoſe things which he that ſhould now hold, would be eſteemed an Arrian*? Is it not the ſame *Perron*, in his Reply to K. *James*, in the fifth Chapter of his fourth Obſervation? And doth he not in the ſame place peach *Tertullian* alſo, and in a manner give him away to the Arrians? And pronounce generally of the *Fathers before the Councel* of Nice, That *the Arrians would gladly be tried by them*? And are not your fellow-Jeſuits alſo, even the prime men of your Order, prevaricators in this point as well as others? Doth not your Friend M. *Fiſher*, or M. *Floyd*, in his book of the Nine Queſtions propoſed to him by K. *James*, ſpeak dangerouſly to the ſame purpoſe, in his diſcourſe *of the reſolution of Faith*, towards the end? Giving us to underſtand, *That the new Reformed Arrians bring very many teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers to prove that in this Point they did contradict themſelves, and were contrary one to another: which places whoſoever ſhall read, will clearly ſee, that to common people they are unanſwerable, yea that common people are not capable of the anſwers that learned men yield unto ſuch obſcure paſſages.* And hath not your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius in Hær. 69.* been very liberal to the Adverſaries of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and in a manner given them for Patrons and Advocates? firſt *Juſtin Martyr*, and then almoſt all the Fathers before the Councel of *Nice*, whoſe ſpeeches, he ſays, touching this point, *cum Orthodoxa fidei regula minimè conſentiunt*? Hereunto I might add, that the Dominicans and Jeſuits between them in another matter of great importance, viz. *God's Preſcience of future contingents*, give the Socinians the premiſes, out of which their concluſion doth unavoidably follow. For the Dominicans maintain on the one Side, that *God can foreſee nothing but what he decrees*: The Jeſuits on the other Side, that *he doth not decree all things*: And from hence the Socinians conclude (as it is obvious for them to do) that *he doth not foreſee all things*. Laſtly, I might adjoyn this, that you agree with one conſent, and ſettle for a rule unqueſtionable, that no part of Religion can be repugnant to reaſon, whereunto you in particular ſubſcribe unawares, in ſaying, *From truth no man can by good conſequence inferr Falſhood*, which is to ſay in effect, that Reaſon can never lead any man to Error: And after you have done ſo, you proclaim to all the world (as you in this Pamphlet do very frequently,) that *if men follow their Reaſon and diſcourſe*, they will (if they underſtand themſelves) be lead to Socinianiſm. And thus you ſee with what probable matter I might furniſh out and juſtifie my accuſation, if I ſhould charge you with leading men to Socinianiſm! Yet I do not conceive that I have ground enough for this odious imputation: And much leſs ſhould you have charged Proteſtants with it, whom you confeſs to abhorre and deteſt it: and who fight againſt it, not with the broken reeds, and out

of

of the paper-fortresses of an imaginary Infallibility, which were only to make sport for their Adversaries; but with the *sword of the Spirit, the Word of God*: Of which we may say most truly, what *David* said of *Goliah*'s Sword, offered by *Abimelech*, *Non est sicut iste, There is none comparable to it.*

19. Thus Protestants in general, I hope, are sufficiently vindicated from your calumny. I proceed now to do the same service for the Divines of *England*; whom you question first in point of learning and sufficiency, and then in point of conscience and honesty, as prevaricating in the Religion which they profess, and inclining to Popery. Their Learning (you say) consists only in *some superficial talent of preaching, languages, and elocution, and not in any deep knowledge of Philosophy, especially of Metaphysicks, and much less of that most solid, profitable, subtile, and* (O rem ridiculam, *Cato*, & jocosam!) *succinct method of School-Divinity.* Wherein you have discovered in your self the true Genius and spirit of detraction. For taking advantage from that wherein Envy it self cannot deny but they are very eminent, and which requires great sufficiency of substantial learning, you disparage them as insufficient in all things else. As if forsooth, because they dispute not eternally, *Utrum Chimera bombinans in vacuo, possit comedere secundas intentiones? Whether a Million of Angels may not sit upon a Needle's point?* Because they fill not their brains with notions that signifie nothing, to the utter extermination of all reason and common sense; and spend not an Age in weaving and unweaving subtile Cobwebs, fitter to catch flyes than Souls; therefore they have no deep knowledge in the Acroamatical part of Learning! But I have too much honoured the poorness of this detraction, to take notice of it.

20. The other Part of your accusation strikes deeper, and is more considerable: And that tels us, that, *Protestantism waxeth weary of it self; that the Professors of it, they especially of greatest worth learning and authority, love Temper and Moderation; and are at this time more unresolved where to fasten, than at the infancy of their Church*: That, *Their Churches begin to look with a new face: Their walls to speak a new language: Their Doctrine to be altered in many things for which their Progenitors forsook the then Visible Church of Christ: For example, The Pope not Antichrist: Prayer for the dead*: Limbus Patrum: *Pictures*: That *the Church hath Authority in determining Controversies of Faith, and to Interpret Scripture; about Free-wil, Predestination, Universal Grace*: That *all our works are not sins: Merit of good works: Inherent Justice: Faith alone doth not justifie: Charity to be preferred before knowledge; Traditions: Commandments possible to be kept*: That *their thirty nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious, of some sense wherein they may seem Catholique*: That to *alledge the necessity of wife and children in these dayes, is but a weak plea for a married Minister to compass a Benefice*: That *Calvinism is at length accounted Heresie, and little less than Treason*: That *men in talk and writing use willingly the once fearful names of Priests and Altars*: That *they are now put in mind, that for exposition of Scripture they are by Canon bound to follow the Fathers: which if they do with sincerity, it is easie to tell what doom will pass against Protestants, seeing, by the confession of Protestants, the Fathers are on the Papists side, which the Answerer to some so clearly demonstrated, that they remained convinced*: In fine, as the Samaritans saw in the Disciples countenances that they meant to go to *Jerusalem*,

ruſalem, ſo you pretend it is even legible in the fore-heads of theſe men, that they are even going, nay making haſte, to *Rome*. Which ſcurrilous Libel void of all truth, diſcretion and honeſty, what effect it may have wrought, what credit it may have gained with credulous Papiſts, (who dream what they deſire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak Proteſtants, I cannot tell: But one thing I dare boldly ſay, that you your ſelf did never believe it.

21. For did you indeed conceive, or had any probable hope, that ſuch men as you deſcribe, men of worth, of learning and authority too, were friends and favourers of your Religion, and inclinable to your Party, Can any imagine that you would proclaim it, and bid the world take heed of them? *Sic notus Ulyſſes?* Do we know the Jeſuits no better than ſo? What, are they turned prevaricators againſt their own Faction? Are they likely men to betray and expoſe their own Agents and Inſtruments, and to awaken the eyes of Jealouſie, and to raiſe the clamor of the people againſt them? Certainly, your Zeal to the See of *Rome*, teſtified by your *fourth Vow of ſpecial obedience to the Pope*, proper to your Order, and your cunning carriage of all affairs for the greater advantage and advancement of that See, are clear demonſtrations that, if you had thought *thus*, you would never have ſaid *ſo*. The truth is, they that run to extreams in oppoſition againſt you, they that pull down your infallibility and ſet up their own, they that declaim againſt your tyranny, and exerciſe it themſelves over others, are the Adverſaries that give you greateſt advantage, and ſuch as you love to deal with: whereas upon men of temper and moderation, ſuch as will oppoſe nothing becauſe you maintain it, but will draw as neer to you, that they may draw you to them, as the truth will ſuffer them; ſuch as require of Chriſtians to believe only in Chriſt, and will damn no Man nor Doctrine without expreſs and certain warrant from God; upon ſuch as theſe you know not how to faſten: but if you chance to have conference with any ſuch, (which yet as much as poſſibly you can you avoid and decline,) you are very ſpeedily put to ſilence, and ſee the indefenſible weakneſs of your cauſe laid open to all men And this, I verily believe, is the true reaſon that you thus rave and rage againſt them, as foreſeeing your time of prevailing, or even of ſubſiſting, would be ſhort, if other Adverſaries gave you no more advantage than they do.

22. In which perſwaſion alſo I am much confirmed by conſideration of the ſillineſs and poorneſs of thoſe Suggeſtions, and partly of the apparent vanity and falſhood of them, which you offer in juſtification of this wicked Calumny. For what, if out devotion towards God, out of a deſire that he ſhould be worſhipped as *in Spirit and truth* in the firſt place, ſo alſo *in the beauty of holineſs*? what if out of fear that too much ſimplicity and nakedneſs in the publique Service of God, may beget in the ordinary ſort of men a dull and ſtupid irreverence; and, out of hope that the outward ſtate and glory of it, being well-diſpoſed and wiſely moderated, may ingender, quicken, increaſe and nouriſh, the inward reverence, reſpect, and devotion which is due unto God's Soveraign Majeſty and Power? what if out of a perſwaſion and deſire that Papiſts may be won over to us the ſooner, by the removing of this ſcandall out of their way; and out of an holy jealouſie, that the weaker ſort of Proteſtants might be the eaſier ſeduced to them by the magnificence and pomp of their Church-

ſervice

ſervice in caſe it were not removed? I ſay, What if out of theſe conſiderations, the Governours of our Church, more of late than formerly, have ſet themſelves to adorn and beautifie the places *where God's Honour dwels*, and to make them as heaven-like as they can with earthly ornaments? Is this a ſign that they are warping towards Popery? Is this devotion in the Church of *England*, an argument that ſhe is coming over to the Church of *Rome?* Sir *Edwin Sands*, I preſume, every man will grant, had no inclination that way; yet he, forty years ſince, highly commended this part of devotion in Papiſts, and makes no ſcruple of propoſing it to the imitation of Proteſtants: Little thinking that they who would follow his counſel, and endeavour to take away this diſparagement of Proteſtants, and this glorying of Papiſts, ſhould have been cenſured for it, as making way and inclining to Popery. His words to this purpoſe are excellent words; and becauſe they ſhew plainly, that what is now practiſed was approved by zealous Proteſtants ſo long ago, I will here ſet them down.

23. *This one thing I cannot but highly commend in that ſort and order: They ſpare nothing which either coſt can perform in enriching, or skill in adorning the Temple of God, or to ſet out his Service with the greateſt pompe and magnificence that can be deviſed. And although, for the moſt part, much baſeneſſe and childiſhneſſe is predominant in the Maſters and Contrivers of their Ceremonies, yet this outward ſtate and glory being well diſpoſed, doth ingender, quicken, increaſe, and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect, and devotion which is due unto Soveraign Majeſty and Power. And although I am not ignorant that many men well reputed have embraced the thrifty opinion of that Diſciple, who thought all to be waſted that was beſtowed upon Chriſt in that ſort, and that it were much better beſtowed upon him or the poor, (yet with an eye perhaps that themſelves would be his quarter-Almoners) notwithſtanding I muſt confeſſe, it will never ſink into my heart, that in proportion of reaſon, the allowance for furniſhing out of the ſervice of God ſhould be meaſured by the ſcant and ſtrict rule of meer neceſſity, (a proportion ſo low, that nature to other moſt bountiful, in matter of neceſſity hath not failed, no not the moſt ignoble creatures of the world,) and that for our ſelves no meaſure of heaping but the moſt we can get, no rule of expence but to the utmoſt pompe we liſt: Or that God himſelf had ſo enriched the lower parts of the world with ſuch wonderfull varieties of beauty and glory, that they might ſerve only to the pampering of mortall man in his pride; and that in the Service of the high Creator Lord and Giver (the outward glory of whoſe higher pallace may appear by the very lamps that we ſee ſo far off burning gloriouſly in it) only the ſimpler, baſer, cheaper, leſſe noble, leſſe beautiful, leſſe glorious things ſhould be imployed. Eſpecially ſeeing, as in Princes Courts, ſo in the Service of God alſo, this outward ſtate and glory, being well diſpoſed, doth (as I have ſaid) ingender, quicken, increaſe and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect, and devotion, which is due to ſo Soveraign Majeſty and Power: Which thoſe whom the uſe thereof cannot perſwade unto, would eaſily, by the want of it, be brought to confeſſe; for which cauſe I crave leave to be excuſed by them herein, if in Zeal to the common Lord of all, I chooſe rather to commend the vertue of an enemy, than to flatter the vice and imbecillity of a friend.* And ſo much for this matter.

24. Again, what if the names of *Prieſts* and *Altars*, ſo frequent in the ancient Fathers, though not in the now Popiſh ſenſe, be now reſumed and more commonly uſed in *England* than of late times they were: that

ſo the colourable argument of their conformity, which is but nominal, with the ancient Church, and our inconformity, which the Governours of the Church would not have ſo much as nominal, may be taken away from them; and the Church of *England* may be put in a ſtate, in this regard more juſtifiable againſt the *Romane* than formerly it was, being hereby enabled to ſay to Papiſts (whenſoever theſe names are objected,) we alſo uſe the names of *Prieſts* and *Altars*, and yet believe neither the corporal Preſence, nor any Proper and propitiatory Sacrifice?

25. What if Proteſtants be now put in minde, that, for expoſition of Scripture, they are bound by a Canon *to follow the ancient Fathers*: which whoſoever doth with ſincerity, it is utterly impoſſible, he ſhould be a Papiſt? And it is moſt falſly ſaid by you, that you know, that to ſome Proteſtants I clearly demonſtrated, or ever ſo much as undertook, or went about to demonſtrate, the contrary. What if the Centuriſts be cenſured ſomewhat roundly by a Proteſtant Divine for affirming, that *the keeping of the Lord's day was a thing indifferent for two hundred years?* Is there in all this or any part of it any kind of proof of this ſcandalous Calumny?

26. As for the points of Doctrine wherein you pretend that theſe Divines begin of late to falter, and to comply with the Church of *Rome*; upon a due examination of particulars it will preſently appear, Firſt, that part of them always have been, and now are, held conſtantly one way by them; as, the Authority of the Church in determining Controverſies of faith, though not the infallibility of it: That there is Inherent Juſtice, though ſo imperfect that it cannot juſtifie: That there are Traditions, though none neceſſary: That charity is to be preferred before knowledge: That good Works are not properly meritorious. And laſtly, that Faith alone juſtifies, though that faith juſtifies not which is alone. And ſecondly, for the remainder, that they, every one of them, have been anciently without breach of charity diſputed among Proteſtants: ſuch for example were the Queſtions about the Pope's being the Antichriſt, The lawfulneſs of ſome kind of prayers for the dead; The Eſtate of the Fathers Souls, before Chriſt's Aſcenſion; Freewill, Predeſtination, Univerſal grace: The poſſibility of keeping God's Commandments; The uſe of Pictures in the Church: Wherein that there hath been anciently diverſity of opinion amongſt Proteſtants, it is juſtified to my hand by a Witneſs, with you, beyond exception, even your great friend M. *Breerly, whoſe care, exactneſs, and fidelity* (you ſay in your Preface) *is ſo extraordinary great*. Conſult him therefore: Tract. 3. Sect. 7. of his *Apology*: And in the 9, 10, 11, 14, 24, 26, 27, 37. Subdiviſions of that *Section*; you ſhall ſee as in a mirror, your ſelf proved an egregious Calumniator, for charging Proteſtants with innovation and inclining to Popery, under pretence forſooth, that their Doctrine begins of late to be altered in theſe points. Whereas, M. *Breerly* will inform you, They have been anciently, and even from the beginning of the Reformation, controverted amongſt them, though perhaps the ſtream and current of their Doctors run one way, and only ſome brook or rivulet of them the other.

27. And thus my Friends, I ſuppoſe, are clearly vindicated from your ſcandals and calumnies: It remains now that in the laſt place I bring my ſelf fairly off from your foul aſperſions, that ſo my Perſon may not be (as indeed howſoever it ſhould not be) any diſadvantage or diſparagement to the Cauſe, nor any ſcandal to weak Chriſtians.

28. Your

28. Your injuries then to me (no way deserved by me, but by differing in opinion from you, (wherein yet you surely differ from me as much as I from you,) are especially three. For *first*, upon hearsay, and refusing to give me opportunity of begetting in you a better understanding of me, you charge me with a great number of false and impious Doctrines, which I will not name in particular, because I will not assist you so far in the spreading of my own undeserved defamation: but whosoever teaches or holds them, *let him be Anathema*! The sum of them all cast up by your self, in your first Chapter, is this, *Nothing ought or can be certainly believed, farther than it may be proved by evidence of Natural Reason*, (where I conceive, Natural reason is opposed to supernatural Revelation;) and whosoever holds so, *let him be Anathema*! And moreover to clear my self once for all, from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injuriously with denial of Supernatural Verities, I profess sincerely, that I believe all those Books of Scripture, which the Church of *England* accounts Canonical, to be the Infallible word of God: I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them: I acknowledge all that to be Heresie, which by the Act of Parliament *primo* of Q. *Eliz.* is declared to be so, and only to be so: And though in such points which may be held diversly of divers men *salvâ Fidei compage*, I would not take any man's liberty from him, and humbly beseech all men, that they would not take mine from me: Yet thus much I can say (which I hope, will satisfie any man of reason,) that whatsoever hath been held necessary to salvation, either by the Catholique Church of all Ages, or by the consent of Fathers, measured by *Vincentius Lyrinensis* his rule, or is held necessary, either by the Catholique Church of this Age, or by the consent of Protestants, or even by the Church of *England*, that, against the Socinians, and all others whatsoever, I do verily believe and embrace.

29. Another great and manifest injury you have done me, in charging me to have forsaken your Religion, *because it conduced not to my temporal ends*, and suted not with my desires and designs: Which certainly is an horrible crime, and whereof if you could convince me, by just and strong Presumptions, I should then acknowledge my self to deserve that Opinion, which you would fain induce your Credents unto, that I changed not your Religion for any other, but for none at all. But of this great fault my conscience acquits me, and God, who only knows the hearts of all men, knows that I am innocent! Neither doubt I but all they who know me, and amongst them many Persons of place and quality, will say, they have reason in this matter to be my Compurgators. And for you, though you are very affirmative in your accusation, yet you neither do, nor can produce any proof or presumption for it, but forgetting your self (as it is God's will oft times that Slanderers should do), have let fall some passages, which being well weighed, will make considering men apt to believe, that you did not believe your self. For how is it possible you should believe that I deserted your Religion for ends, and against the light of my conscience, out of a desire of preferment; and yet, out of scruple of conscience, should refuse (which also you impute to me,) to subscribe the 39. Articles, that is, refuse to enter at the only common door, which here in *England* leads to preferment? Again, How incredible is it that

you ſhould believe, that I forſook the profeſſion of your Religion, as not ſuting with my deſires and deſigns, which yet reconciles the enjoying of the pleaſures and profits of ſin here, with the hope of happineſs hereafter, and propoſes as great hope of great temporal advancements to the capable ſervants of it, as any, nay more than any, Religion in the world; and inſtead of this ſhould chooſe Socinianiſm, a Doctrine, which howſoever erroneous in explicating the Myſteries of Religion, and allowing greater liberty of opinion in ſpeculative matters, than any other Company of Chriſtians doth or they ſhould do; yet certainly which you, I am ſure, will pretend and maintain to explicate the Laws of Chriſt with more rigor, and leſs indulgence and condeſcendence to the deſires of fleſh and blood than your Doctrine doth! And beſides, ſuch a Doctrine by which no man in his right minde, can hope for any honour or preferment, either in this Church or State, or any other! All which clearly demonſtrates that this foul and falſe aſperſion, which you have caſt upon me, proceeds from no other fountain, but a heart abounding with the gall and bitterneſs of uncharitableneſs, and even blinded with malice towards me; or elſe from a perverſe zeal to your ſuperſtition, which ſecretly ſuggeſts this perſwaſion to you, That for the Catholique cauſe nothing is unlawful, but that you may make uſe of ſuch indirect and crooked Arts, as theſe, to blaſt my reputation, and to poſſeſs mens minds with diſaffection to my Perſon, leſt otherwiſe peradventure they might with ſome indifference hear reaſon from me. God, I hope, which bringeth light out of darkneſs, will turn your counſels to fooliſhneſs, and give all good men grace to perceive how weak and ruinous that Religion muſt be, which needs ſupportance from ſuch tricks and devices! So I call them, becauſe they deſerve no better name. For what are all theſe Perſonal matters, which hitherto you have ſpoke of, to the buſineſs in hand? If it could be proved that Cardinal *Bellarmine* was indeed a Jew, or that Cardinal *Perron* was an Atheiſt, yet I preſume you would not accept of this for an Anſwer to all their Writings in defence of your Religion. Let then my actions, and intentions, and opinions be what they will, yet I hope, Truth is nevertheleſs Truth, nor Reaſon ever the leſs Reaſon, becauſe I ſpeak it. And therefore the Chriſtian Reader, knowing that his Salvation or damnation depends upon his impartial and ſincere judgement of theſe things, will guard himſelf, I hope, from theſe impoſtures, and regard not the perſon, but the cauſe and the reaſons of it; not who ſpeaks, but what is ſpoken: Which is all the favour I deſire of him, as knowing that I am deſirous not to perſwade him, unleſs it be truth whereunto I perſwade him.

30. The third and laſt part of my Accuſation was, That I anſwer out of *Principles which Proteſtants themſelves will profeſs to deteſt*: which indeed were to the purpoſe, if it could be juſtified. But, beſides that it is confuted by my whole Book, and made ridiculous by the Approbations premiſed unto it, it is very eaſie for me out of your own mouth and words to prove it a moſt injurious calumny. For what one concluſion is there in the whole fabrick of my Diſcourſe, that is not naturally deducible out of this one Principle, That *all things neceſſary to ſalvation are evidently contained in Scripture?* Or, what one Concluſion almoſt of importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one clearly confutable?

31. Grant

31. Grant this, and it will presently follow in opposition to your first Conclusion, and the Argument of your *first Chap.* that amongst men of different opinions, touching the obscure and controverted Questions of Religion, such as may with probability be disputed on both Sides (and such are the disputes of Protestants;) Good men and lovers of truth of all Sides may be saved; because all necessary things being supposed evident concerning them, with men so qualified, there will be no difference: There being no more certain sign that a Point is not evident, than that honest and understanding and indifferent men, and such as give themselves liberty of judgement after a mature consideration of the matter, differ about it.

32. Grant this, and it will appear *Secondly*, that the meanes whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding, and which are to determine all Controversies in Faith, necessary to be determined, may be, for any thing you have said to the contrary, not a Church, but the Scripture; which contradicts the Doctrine of your *Second Chapter*.

33. Grant this, and the distinction of Points Fundamental and not Fundamental, will appear very good and pertinent. For those truths will be Fundamental, which are evidently delivered in Scripture, and commanded to be preached to all men; Those not Fundamental, which are obscure. And nothing will hinder but that the Catholique Church may err in the latter kind of the said Points: because Truths not necessary to the Salvation, cannot be necessary to the Beeing of a Church; and because it is not absolutely necessary that God should assist his Church any farther than to bring her to Salvation; neither will there be any necessity at all of any infallible Guide, either to consign unwritten Traditions, or to declare the obscurities of the Faith. Not for the former end, because this Principle being granted true, nothing unwritten can be necessary to be consigned. Nor for the latter, because nothing that is obscure can be necessary to be understood, or not mistaken. And so the discourse of your whole *Third Chap.* will presently vanish.

34. Fourthly, for the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of simple belief, though I see not how it may be deduced from this Principle, yet the granting of this, plainly renders the whole dispute touching the Creed unnecessary. For if all necessary things of all sorts, whether of simple belief or practice, be confessed to be clearly contained in Scripture, What imports it whether those of one sort be contained in the Creed?

35. Fifthly, let this be granted, and the immediate Corollary in opposition to your *fifth Chap.* will be and must be, That not Protestants for rejecting, but the Church of *Rome* for imposing upon the Faith of Christians, Doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for disturbing the Churche's peace, and dividing Unity for such matters, is in a high degree presumptuous and Schismatical.

36. Grant this sixthly, and it will follow unavoidably that Protestants cannot possibly be Hereticks, seeing they believe all things evidently contained in Scripture, which are supposed to be all that is necessary to be believed: and so your *Sixth Chapter* is clearly confuted.

37. Grant this lastly, and it will be undoubtedly consequent, in contradiction of your *Seventh Chapter*, that no man can shew more charity to himself than by continuing a Protestant; seeing Protestants are supposed to believe, and therefore may accordingly practise, at least by their Re-

ligion are not hindered from practising and performing all things necessary to Salvation.

38. So that the position of this one Principle, is the direct overthrow of your whole Book: and therefore I needed not, nor indeed have I made use of any other. Now this Principle, which is not only the corner-stone or chief Pillar, but even the basis, and adequate foundation of my Answer; and which while it stands firm and unmoveable, cannot but be the supporter of my Book, and the certain ruine of Yours, is so far from being, according to your pretence, detested by all Protestants, that all Protestants whatsoever, as you may see in their harmony of Confessions, unanimously profess and maintain it. And you your self, Chap. 6. §. 30. plainly confess as much, in saying, *The whole Edifice of the Faith of Protestants is setled on these two Principles: These particular Books are Canonical Scripture: And the sense and meaning of them is plain and evident, at least, in all Points necessary to Salvation.*

39. And thus your Venom against me is in a manner spent, saving only that there remain two little Impertinencies, whereby you would disable me from being a fit Advocate for the cause of Protestants. The first, because I refuse to subscribe the Articles of the Church of *England*: The second, because I have set down in writing, Motives which sometime induced me to forsake Protestantism, and hitherto have not answered them.

40. By the former of which Objections it should seem, that either you conceive the 39. Articles the common Doctrine of all Protestants; and if they be, Why have you so often upbraided them with their many and great differences? Or else, that it is the peculiar defence of the Church of *England*, and not the common cause of all Protestants, which is here undertaken by me: which are certainly very gross Mistakes. And yet why he who makes scruple of subscribing the truth of one or two Propositions, may not yet be fit enough to maintain that those who do subscribe them are in a savable condition, I do not understand. Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all Protestants absolutely true, (which with reason cannot be required of me while they hold Contradictions,) yet I hold it free from all impiety, and from all error destructive of Salvation, or in it self damnable: And this I think in reason may sufficiently qualifie me, for a maintainer of this assertion, that *Protestancy destroys not Salvation*. For the Church of *England*, I am perswaded, that the constant Doctrine of it is so pure and Orthodox, that whosoever believes it, and lives according to it, undoubtedly he shall be saved; and that there is no Error in it which may necessitate or warrant any man to disturb the peace, or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subscription; and thus much if you conceive me not ready to subscribe, your *Charity* I assure you is much *Mistaken*.

41. Your other objection against me, is yet more impertinent and frivolous than the former: Unless perhaps it be a just exception against a Physitian, that himself was sometimes in, and recovered himself from, that disease which he undertakes to cure; or against a Guide in a way, that at first, before he had experience himself, mistook it, and afterwards found his error and amended it. That noble Writer *Michael de Montaigne*, was surely of a far different minde; for he will hardly allow any Physitian competent, but only for such diseases as himself had passed through:

And

And a far greater than *Montaigne*, even he that said, *Tu conversus confirma fratres*, gives us sufficiently to understand that they which have themselves been in such a state as to need conversion, are not thereby made incapable of, but rather engaged and obliged unto, and qualified for, this charitable function.

42. Neither am I guilty of that strange and preposterous zeal (as you esteem it) which you impute to me; for having been so long careless in removing this scandal against Protestants, and answering my own Motives, and yet now shewing such fervor in writing against others. For neither are they other Motives, but the very same for the most part with those which abused me, against which this Book which I now publish, is in a maner wholly imployed: And besides, though you Jesuits take upon you to have such large and universal intelligence of all State-affairs and matters of importance; yet I hope such a contemptible matter, as an Answer of mine to a little piece of paper, may very probably have been written and escaped your Observation. The truth is, I made an Answer to them three years since and better, which perhaps might have been published, but for two reasons; One, because the Motives were never publique, until you made them so: The other, because I was loath to proclaim to all the world so much weakness as I shewed, in suffering my self to be abused by such silly Sophisms; All which proceed upon mistakes and false suppositions, which unadvisedly I took for granted; as when I have set down the Motives in order, by subsequent Answers to them, I shall quickly demonstrate, and so make an end.

43. The Motives then were these.

1. *Because perpetuall visible profession, which could never be wanting to the Religion of Christ, nor any part of it, is apparently wanting to Protestant Religion, so far as concerns the points in contestation.*

2. *Because* Luther *and his Followers, separating from the Church of* Rome, *separated also from all Churches, pure or impure, true or false then being in the World; upon which ground I conclude, that either Gods promises did fail of performance, if there were then no Church in the world, which held all things necessary, and nothing repugnant to Salvation; or else that* Luther *and his Sectaries, separating from all Churches then in the World, and so from the true, if there were any true, were* damnable Schismaticks.

3. *Because, if any credit may be given to as creditable Records as any are extant, the Doctrine of Catholiques hath been frequently confirmed; and the opposite Doctrine of Protestants confounded, with supernatural and divine Miracles.*

4. *Because many points of Protestant doctrine, are the damned opinions of Heretiques, condemned by the Primitive Church.*

5. *Because the Prophecies of the old Testament, touching the conversion of Kings and Nations to the true Religion of Christ, have been accomplished in and by the Catholique* Roman *Religion, and the Professors of it; and not by Protestant Religion, and the Professors of it.*

6. *Because the doctrine of the Church of* Rome *is conformable, and the Doctrine of Protestants contrary to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, even by the confession of Protestants themselves; I mean, those Fathers, who lived within the compasse of the first 600. years; to whom Protestants themselves do very frequently and very confidently appeal.*

7. *Because*

7. *Because the first pretended Reformers had neither extraordinary* Commission *from God, nor ordinary* Mission *from the Church, to Preach Protestant Doctrine.*

8. *Because* Luther, *to preach against the Masse (which contains the most material points now in Controversie) was perswaded by reasons suggested to him by the Devil himself, disputing with him. So himself professeth in his Book* de Missa Privata: *That all men might take heed of following him, who professeth himself to follow the Devill.*

9. *Because the Protestant cause is now, and hath been from the beginning, maintained with grosse falsifications, and Calumnies; whereof their prime Controversie-Writers, are notoriously and in high degree guilty.*

10. *Because by denying all humane authority, either of Pope, or Councels, or Church, to determine Controversies of Faith, they have abolished all possible means of suppressing Heresie, or restoring Unity to the Church.*

These are the Motives; now my Answers to them follow briefly and in order.

44. To the first: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that his true Doctrine should *de facto* be alwayes visibly professed, without any mixture of falshood.

To the second: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that there shall be always a visible company of men free from all error in it self damnable. Neither is it always of necessity Schismatical to separate from the external communion of a Church, though wanting nothing necessary. For if this Church supposed to want nothing necessary, require me to profess against my conscience, that I believe some errour, though never so small and innocent, which I do not believe, and will not allow me her Communion but upon this condition; In this case the Church for requiring this condition is Schismatical, and not I for separating from the Church.

To the third: If any credit may be given to Records far more creditable than these, the Doctrine of Protestants, that is, the Bible, hath been confirmed, and the Doctrine of Papists, which is in many points plainly opposite to it, confounded with supernatural and divine Miracles, which for number and glory outshine Popish pretended Miracles, as much as the Sun doth an *Ignis fatuus*; those I mean which were wrought by our Saviour Christ and his Apostles: Now this Book, by the confession of all sides confirmed by innumerous Miracles, foretels me plainly, that in after-ages great signs and wonders shall be wrought in confirmation of false doctrin, and that I am not to believe any doctrin which seems to my understanding repugnant to the first, though an Angel from Heaven should teach it; which were certainly as great a Miracle as any that was ever wrought in attestation of any part of the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. But that true doctrine should in all ages have the testimony of Miracles, that I am no where taught; So that I have more reason to suspect, and be afraid of pretended Miracles, as signs of false doctrine, than much to regard them as certain Arguments of the Truth. Besides, setting aside the Bible, and the Tradition of it, there is as good story for Miracles wrought by those who lived and dyed in opposition to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, (as by S. *Cyprian*, *Colmannus*, *Columbanus*, *Aidanus*, and others,) as there is for those that are pretended to be wrought by the members of that Church. Lastly, it seems to me no strange thing that God in his Justice should permit

mit some true Miracles to be wrought to delude them, who have forged so many as apparently the Professors of the *Roman* Doctrin have, to abuse the World.

To the fourth: All those were not [a] Heretiques which by *Philastrius*, *Epiphanius*, or S. *Austin* were put in the Catalogue of Heretiques.

To the fifth: Kings and Nations have been and may be converted by men of contrary Religions.

To the sixth: The Doctrin of Papists, is confessed by Papists contrary to the Fathers in many points.

To the seventh: The Pastors of a Church cannot but have authority from it, to Preach against the abuses of it, whether in Doctrin or Practice, if there be any in it: Neither can any Christian want an ordinary commission from God to do a necessary work of Charity after a peaceable manner, when there is no body else that can or will do it. In extraordinary cases, extraordinary courses are not to be disallowed. If some Christian Layman should come into a Countrey of Infidels, and had ability to perswade them to Christianity, Who would say, he might not use it for want of Commission!

To the eighth: *Luther's* conference with the Devil might be, for ought I know, nothing but a melancholy Dream. If it were reall, the Devil might perswade *Luther* from the Masse, hoping by doing so to keep him constant to it: Or that others would make his disswasion from it an Argument for it, (as we see Papists do) and be afraid of following *Luther*, as confessing himself to have been perswaded by the Devill.

To the ninth: *Iliacos intra muros peccatur & extra.* Papists are more guilty of this fault than Protestants. Even this very Author in this very Pamphlet hath not so many leaves as falsifications and calumnies.

To the tenth: Let all men believe the Scripture and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true sense, and require no more of others, and they shall find this not only a better, but the only means to suppress Heresie, and restore Unity. For he that believes the Scripture sincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true sense, cannot possibly be an Heretique. And if no more than this were required of any man, to make him capable of the Churches Communion, then all men so qualified, though they were different in opinion, yet notwithstanding any such difference, must be of necessity one in Communion.

[a] See this acknowledged by *Bellar. de Script. Eccles. in Philastrio.* By *Petavius Animad. in Epiph. de inscrip. operis.* By S. *Austin Lib. de Hær. Hær.* 80.

The AUTHOR of *CHARITY MAINTAINED*, His Preface to the READER.

Give me leave (good Reader) to inform thee, by way of Preface, of three Points. The first concerns D. *Potters Answer*, to *Charity Mistaken*. The second relates to this *Reply* of mine. And the third contains some *Premonitions*, or *Prescriptions*, in case D. *Potter*, or any in his behalf, think fit to Rejoyn.

2. For the first point, concerning D. *Potters Answer*, I say, in general, reserving particulars to their proper places, that in his whole Book he hath not so much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in question, which was, Whether both Catholiques and Protestants can be saved in their several professions? And therefore *Charity Mistaken* judiciously pressing those particulars, wherein the difficulty doth precisely consist, proves in general, that there is but one true Church; that all Christians are obliged to hearken to her; that she must be ever visible, and infallible; that to separate ones self from her communion is Schism; and to dissent from her Doctrin is Heresie, though it be in points never so few, or never so small in their own nature; and therefore that the distinction of points Fundamental, and not Fundamental, is wholly vain, as it is applyed by Protestants. These (I say) and some other general grounds, *Charity Mistaken* handles, and out of them doth clearly evince, that any least difference in faith cannot stand with salvation on both sides: and therefore since it is apparent, that Catholiques and Protestants disagree in very many points of faith, they both cannot hope to be saved without repentance: and consequently, as we hold, that Protestancy unrepented *destroyes Salvation*; so must they also believe that we cannot be saved, if they judge their own Religion to be true, and ours to be false. And whosoever disguizeth this truth, is an enemy to souls, which he deceives with ungrounded false hopes of Salvation, in different Faiths, and Religions. And this *Charity Mistaken* performed exactly, according to that which appears to have been his design, which was not to descend to particular disputes, as D. *Potter* affectedly does, namely, Whether or no the *Roman*-Church be the only true Church of Christ; and much lesse, Whether general Councels be infallible; whether the Pope may erre in his Decrees common to the whole Church; whether he be above a General Council; whether all points of Faith be contained in Scripture; whether Faith be resolved into the authority of the Church, as into his last *formal Object*, and *Motive*; and, least of all, did he discourse of Images, Communion under both kinds, publique service in an unknown Tongue, Seven Sacraments, Sacrifice of the Masse, Indulgences, and *Index Expurgatorius*: All which, and divers other articles, D. *Potter* (as I said) draws by violence into his Book: and he might have brought in Pope *Joan*, or Antichrist, or the *Jews* who are permitted to live in *Rome*, which are common Themes for men that want better matter, as D. *Potter* was fain to fetch in the aforesaid Controversies, that so he might dazle the eyes, and distract the minde of the Reader, and hinder him from perceiving, that in his whole answer he uttereth nothing to the purpose and point in question: which, if he had followed closely, I dare well say, he might have dispatched his whole Book, in two or three sheets of paper. But the truth is, he was loath to affirm plainly, that generally both Catholiques and Protestants may be saved: and yet seeing it to be most evident that Protestants cannot pretend to have any true Church before *Luther*, except the *Roman*, and such as agreed with her, and consequently, that they cannot hope for Salvation; if they deny it to us: he thought best to avoid this difficulty by confusion of language, and to fill up his Book with Points which make nothing to the purpose. Wherein he is lesse excusable, because he must grant, that those very particulars to which he digresseth, are not Fundamental errors, though it should be granted that they be Errors, which indeed are Catholique Verities. For since they be not Fundamental, not destructive of Salvation, what imports it, Whether we hold them or no, for as much as concerns our possibility to be saved?

3. In one thing only he will perhaps seem to have touched the point in question, to wit, in his distinction of points Fundamental, and not Fundamental: because some may think, that a difference in points which are not Fundamental, breaks not the Unity of Faith, and hinders not the hope of Salvation in persons so disagreeing. And yet, in this very distinction, he never speaks to the purpose indeed, but only sayes, That there are some points so Fundamental, as that all are obliged to know and *believe* them explicitely; but never tels us, whether there be any other points of Faith, which a man may deny or *disbelieve*, though they be sufficiently presented to his understanding, as truths revealed, or testified by Almighty God; which was the only thing in question. For if it be damnable, as certainly it is, to deny or disbelieve any one truth witnessed by Almighty God, though the thing be not in it self of any great consequence, or moment; and since of two disagreeing in matters of Faith, one must necessarily deny some such truth; it clearly followes that amongst men of different Faiths, or Religions, one only can be saved, though their difference consist of divers, or but even one point, which is not in his own nature Fundamental, as I declare at large in divers places of my first Part. So that it is clear, D. *Potter* even in this his last refuge and distinction, never comes to the point in question; to say nothing that he himself doth quite overthrow it, and plainly contradict his whole designe, as I shew in the third Chapter of my *first Part*.

4. And

4. And as for *D. Potter*'s manner of handling those very points, which are utterly beside the purpose; it consists only in bringing vulgar mean Objections, which have been answered a thousand times, yea, and some of them are clearly answered even in *Charity Mistaken*; but he takes no knowledge at all of any such answers, and much less doth he apply himself to confute them. He alledgeth also Authors with so great corruption and fraud, as I would not have believed, if I had not found it by clear and frequent experience. In his second *Edition*, he hath indeed left out one or two gross corruptions, amongst many others no less notorious, having, as it seems, been warned by some friends, that they could not stand with his credit: but even in this his second *Edition* he retracts them not at all, nor declares that he was mistaken in the *First*, and so his Reader of the first *Edition* shall ever be deceived by him, though withall he read the *Second*. For preventing of which inconvenience, I have thought it necessary to take notice of them, and to discover them in my *Reply*.

5. And for conclusion of this point I will only say, that *D. Potter* might well have spared his pains if he had ingenuously acknowledged, where the whole substance, yea and sometime the very words and phrases of his Book may be found in far briefer manner, namely, in a *Sermon* of *D. Usher*'s preached before our late Soveraign Lord *King James*, the 20. of June 1624. at *Wansted*, containing *A Declaration of the Universality of the Church of Christ, and the unity of Faith professed therein*; which Sermon having been roundly and wittily confuted by a Catholique Divine, under the name of *Paulus Veridicus*, within the compass of about four sheets of Paper, *D. Potter's Answer to Charity Mistaken* was in effect confuted before it appeared. And this may suffice for a general Censure of his Answer to *Charity Mistaken*.

Concerning my Reply.

6. For the second, touching my *Reply*: if you wonder at the Bulk thereof, compared either with *Charity Mistaken*, or *D. Potter's Answer*, I desire you to consider well of what now I am about to say, and then I hope you will see, that I was cast upon a meer necessity of not being so short, as otherwise might peradventure be desired. *Charity Mistaken* is short, I grant, and yet very full, and large, for as much as concerned his design, which you see was not to treat of particular Controversies in Religion, no not so much as to debate whether or no the Romane Church be the only true Church of Christ, which indeed would have required a larger Volume, as I have understood there was one then coming forth, if it had not been prevented by the Treatise of *Charity Mistaken*, which seemed to make the other intended work a little less seasonable at that time. But *Charity Mistaken* proves only in General out of some Universal Principles, well backed and made good by choice and solid Authorities, that of two disagreeing in points of Faith, one only without repentance can be saved; which aim exacted no great bulk. And as for *D. Potter's Answer*, even that also is not so short, as it may seem. For if his marginal notes printed in a small letter were transferred into the Text, the Book would appear to be of some bulk: though indeed it might have been very short, if he had kept himself to the point treated by *Charity Mistaken*, as shall be declared anon. But contrarily, because the question debated betwixt *Charity Mistaken* and *D. Potter*, is a point of the highest consequence that can be imagined, and in regard that there is not a more pernitious Heresie, or rather indeed ground of Atheism, than a perswasion that men of different Religions may be saved, if otherwise, forsooth, they lead a kind of civil and moral life: I conceive, that my chief endeavour was not to be employed in answering *D. Potter*, but that it was necessary to handle the Question it self somewhat at large, and not only to prove in geral, that both Protestants and Catholiques cannot be saved; but to shew also, that Salvation cannot be hoped for out of the Catholique Roman Church; and yet withall, not to omit to answer all the particulars of *D. Potter*'s Book which may any way import. To this end I thought it fit to divide my *Reply* into *two Parts*; in the former whereof, the main question is handled by a continued discourse without stepping aside to confute the particulars of *D. Potter's Answer*, though yet so, as even that in this first *Part*, I omit not to answer such passages of his, as I find directly in my way, and naturally belong to the points whereof I treat: and in the second *Part* I answer *D. Potter*'s Treatise, *Section* by *Section*, as they lie in order. I here therefore intreat the Reader, that if heartily he desire satisfaction in this so important Question, he do not content himself with that which I say to *D. Potter* in my second *Part*, but that he take the *First* before him, either all, or at least so much as may serve most to his purpose of being satisfied in those doubts which press him most. For which purpose, I have caused a Table of the Chapters of the first *Part*, together with their Titles and Arguments, to be prefixed before my Reply.

7. This was then a chief reason why I could not be very short. But yet there wanted not also divers other causes of the same effect. For there are so several kinds of Protestants through the difference of Tenets which they hold, as that if a man convince but one kind of them, the rest will conceive themselves to be as truly unsatisfied, and even unspoken to, as if nothing had been said therein at all. As for example: Some hold a necessity of a perpetual visible Church, and some hold no such necessity. Some of them hold it necessary to be able to prove it distinct from ours; and others, that their business is dispatched when they have proved ours to have been alwayes visible: for then they will conceive that theirs hath been so: And the like may be truly said of very many other particulars. Besides it is *D. Potter*'s fashion, (wherein as he is very far from being the first, so I pray God he prove the last of that humour) to touch in a word many trivial old Objections, which, if they be not all answered, it will and must serve the turn, to make the ignorant sort of men believe and brag, as if some main unanswerable matter had been subtilly and purposely omitted; and every body knows that some Objection may be very plausibly made in few words, the clear and solid answer whereof will require more leaves of paper than one. And in particular *D. Potter* doth couch his corruption of Authors within the compass of so few lines, and with so great confusedness and fraud, that it requires much time, pains, and paper to open them so distinctly, as that they may appear to every man's eye. It was also necessary to shew what *D. Potter* omits in *Charity Mistaken*, and the importance of what is omitted, and sometimes to set down the very words themselves that are omitted,

all

words themselves that are omitted, all which could not but add to the quantity of my *Reply*. And as for the *quality* thereof, I desire thee (good Reader) to believe, that whereas nothing is more necessary than Books for answering of Books: yet I was so ill furnished in this kind, that I was forced to omit the examination of divers Authors cited by *D. Potter*, meerly upon necessity; though I did very well perceive by most apparent circumstances, that I must probably have been sure enough so finde them plainly misalledged, and much wronged: and for the few which are examined, there hath not wanted some difficulties to do it. For the times are not for all men alike; and *D. Potter* hath much advantage therein. But Truth is truth, and will ever be able to justifie it self in the midst of all difficulties which may occurr. And as for me, when I alledge Protestant Writers as well Domestical as Forrain, I willingly and thankfully acknowledge my self obliged for divers of them to the Author of the Book entituled, *The Protestant's Apology for the Romane Church*, who calls himself *John Breerly*, whose care, exactness, and fidelity is so extraordinary great, as that he doth not only cite the Books, but the Editions also, with the place and time of their Printing, yea and often the very page; and line, where the words are to be had. And if you happen not to finde what he cites, yet suspend your judgement, till you have read the corrections placed at the end of his Book; though it be also true, that after all diligence and faithfulness on his behalf, it was not in his power to amend all the faults of the Print: in which Prints we have difficulty enough for many evident reasons, which must needs occurr to any prudent man.

8. And forasmuch as concerns the manner of my *Reply*, I have procured to do it without all bitterness or gall of invective words, both for as much as may import either Protestants in general, or *D. Potter*'s person in particular; unless, for example, he will call it bitterness for me to term a gross impertineney, a *sleight*, or a *corruption*, by those very names, without which I do not know how to express the things; and yet therein I can truly affirm that I have studied how to deliver them in the most moderate way, to the end I might give as little effence as possibly I could, without betraying the Cause. And if any unfit phrase may peradventure have escaped my pen (as I hope none hath) it was beside, and against my intention, though I must needs profess, that *D. Potter* gives so many and so just occasions of being round with him, as that perhaps some will judge me to have been rather remiss, than moderate. But since in the very title of my *Reply* I profess to *maintain Charity*, I conceive that the excess will be more excusable amongst all kinds of men, if it fall to be in mildness, than if it had appeared in too much zeal. And if *D. Potter* have a mind to charge me with ignorance or any thing of that nature, I can, and will ease him of that labour, by acknowledging in my self as many and more personal defects than he can heap upon me. Truth only, and sincerity, I so much value and profess, as that he shall never be able to prove the contrary in any one least passage or particle against me.

9. In the third and last place, I have thought fit to express my self thus. If *D. Potter*, or any other resolve to answer my *Reply*; I desire that he will observe some things which may tend to his own reputation, the saving of my unnecessary pains, and especially to the greater advantage of truth. I wish then that he would be careful to consider, wherein the point of every difficulty consists, and not impertinently to shoot at Rovers, and affectedly mistake one thing for another. As for example, to what purpose (for as much as concerns the question between *D. Potter* and *Charity Mistaken*,) doth he so often and seriously labour to prove, that Faith is not resolved into the Authority of the Church, as into the formal *Object* and *Motive* thereof? Or that all Points of Faith are contained in Scripture? Or that the Church cannot make new Articles of Faith? Or that the Church of *Rome*, as it signifies that particular Church or Dioces, is not all one with the Universal Church? Or that the Pope as a private Doctor may err? With many other such points as will easily appear in their proper places. It will also be necessary for him not to put certain Doctrines upon us, from which he knows we disclaim as much as himself. Rules to be observed, if *D. Potter* intend a Rejoynder.

10. I must in like manner intreat him not to recite my reasons and discourses by halfs, but to set them down faithfully and entirely, for as much as in very deed concerns the whole substance of the thing in question: because the want sometime of one word, may chance to make void, or lessen the force of the whole Argument. And I am the more solicitous about giving this particular caveat, because I find how ill he hath complied with the promise which he made in his Preface to the Reader, not to omit *without answer any one thing of moment in all the discourse of Charity Mistaken*. Neither will this course be a cause that his *Rejoynder* grow too large, but it will be occasion of brevity to him, and free me also from the pains of setting down all the words which he omits, and himself of demonstrating, that what he omitted was not material. Nay, I will assure him, that if he keep himself to the point of every difficulty, and not weary the Reader, and overcharge his margent with unnecessary quotations of Authors in Greek and Latine, and sometime also in Italian and French, together with Proverbs, Sentences of Poets, and such Grammatical stuff, nor affect to cite a multitude of our Catholique School-Divines to no purpose at all; his Book will not exceed a competent size, nor will any man in reason be offended with that length which is regulated by necessity. Again, before he come to set down his answer, or propose his Arguments, let him consider very well what may be replyed, and whether his own objections may not be retorted against himself, as the Reader will perceive to have hapned often to his disadvantage in my *Reply* against him. But especially I expect, and Truth it self exacts at his hand, that he speak clearly and distinctly, and not seek to walk in darkness, so to delude and deceive his Reader, now saying, and then denying, and alwayes speaking with such ambiguity, as that his greatest care may seem to consist in a certain Art to find a shift, as his occasions might chance, either now, or hereafter to require, and as he might fall out to be urged by diversity of several Arguments. And to the end it may appear that I deal plainly, as I would have him also do, I desire that he declare himself concerning these points.

11. First, whether our Saviour Christ have not alwayes had, and be not ever to have, a visible true Church on earth: and whether the contrary Doctrine be not a damnable heresie.

12. Secondly, what visible Church there was before *Luther*, disagreeing from the *Roman* Church, and agreeing with the pretended Church of Protestants.

13. Thirdly, Since he will be forced to grant, That there can be assigned no visible true Church of Christ, distinct from the Church of *Rome*, and such Churches as agreed with her, when *Luther* first appeared; whether it doth not follow, that she hath not erred Fundamentally; because every such error destroyes the nature and beeing of the Church, and so our Saviour Christ should have had no visible Church on earth.

14. Fourthly, if the *Roman* Church did not fall into any Fundamental error, let him tell us how it can be *damnable* to live in her Communion, or to maintain errors, which are known and confessed, not to be Fundamental, or *damnable*.

15. Fiftly, if her Errors were not damnable, nor did exclude salvation, how can they be excused from *Schism*, who forsook her Communion upon pretence of errors, which were not damnable.

16. Sixthly, if D. *Potter* have a minde to say, That her Errors are Damnable, or Fundamental, let him do us so much charity, as to tell us, in particular, what those Fundamental errors be. But he must still remember (and my self must be excused, for repeating it) that if he say, The *Roman* Church erred Fundamentally, he will not be able to shew, that Christ our Lord had any visible Church on earth, when *Luther* appeared: and let him tell us, How Protestants had, or can have, any Church which was universal, and extended her self to all ages, if once he grant that the *Roman* Church ceased to be the true Church of Christ; and consequently, how they can hope for Salvation, if they deny it to us.

17. Seventhly, whether any one Error maintained against any one Truth, though never so small in it self, yet sufficiently propounded as testified or revealed by Almighty God, do not destroy the Nature and Unity of Faith, or at least is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation.

18. Eighthly, if this be so, how can *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Swinglians*, and all the rest of disagreeing Protestants, hope for Salvation, since it is manifest, that some of them must needs err against some such truth as is testified by Almighty God, either Fundamental, or at least not Fundamental.

19. Ninthly, we constantly urge, and require to have a particular Catalogue of such Points as he cals Fundamental: A Catalogue, I say, in *particular*, and not only some *general* definition, or description, wherein Protestants may perhaps agree, though we see that they differ when they come to assign what Points in particular be Fundamental; and yet upon such a particular Catalogue much depends: as for example, in particular, Whether or no a man do not err in some Point Fundamental or necessary to Salvation; and whether or no *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and the rest, do disagree in Fundamentals; which if they do, the same heaven cannot receive them all.

20. Tenthly and lastly, I desire that in answering to these Points, he would let us know distinctly, what is the Doctrine of the Protestant *English* Church concerning them, and what he utters only as his own private opinion.

21. These are the Questions, which, for the present, I find it fit and necessary for me to ask of D. *Potter*, or any other who will defend his cause, or impugne ours. And it will be in vain to speak vainly, and to tell me, that a Fool may ask more questions in an hour, than a Wise man can answer in a year; with such idle Proverbs as that. For I ask but such questions as for which he gives occasion in his Book, and where he declares not himself, but after so ambiguous and confused a manner, as that Truth it self can scarce tell how to convince him so, but that with ignorant and ill-judging men, he will seem to have somewhat left to say for himself, though Papists (as he cals them) and Puritans should presse him contrary wayes at the same time: and these questions concern things also of high importance, as whereupon the knowledge of God's Church, and true Religion, and consequently, Salvation of the soul, depends. And now because he shall not taxe me with being like those men in the Gospel, whom our blessed Lord and Saviour charged with laying heavy burdens upon other mens shoulders, who yet would not touch them with their finger: I oblige my self to answer upon any demand of his, both to all these Questions, if he find that I have not done it already, and to any other, concerning matter of Faith that he shall ask. And I will tell him very plainly, what is Catholique Doctrin, and what is not, that is, what is defined, or what is not defined, and rests but in discussion among Divines.

22. And it will be here expected, that he perform these things, as a man who professeth learning should do, not flying from questions which concern things as they are considered in their own nature, to accidental or rare circumstances, of ignorance, incapacity, want of means to be instructed, erroneous conscience, and the like; which being very various and different, cannot be well comprehended under any general Rule. But in delivering general Doctrins, we must consider things, as they be *ex natura rei*, or *per se loquendo* (as Divines speak) that is, according to their natures, if all circumstances concurr proportionable thereunto. As for example, some may for a time have invincible ignorance, even of some Fundamental Article of Faith, through want of capacity, instruction, or the like, and so not offend either in such ignorance or error, and yet we must absolutely say, that error in any one Fundamental point is damnable; because so it is, if we consider things in themselves, abstracting from accidental circumstances in particular persons: as contrarily, if some man judge some act of virtue, or some indifferent action to be a sin, in him it is a sin indeed, by reason of his erroneous conscience; and yet we ought not to say absolutely, that virtuous or indifferent actions are sins: and in all sciences we must distinguish the general Rules from their particular Exceptions. And therefore when, for example, he answers to our Demand, Whether he hold that Catholiques may be saved, or, Whether their pretended errors be Fundamental and Damnable, he is not to change the state of the question, and have recourse to Ignorance, and the like; but to answer concerning the errors being considered what they are apt to be in themselves, and as they are neither increased nor diminished, by accidental circumstances.

23. And the like I say of all the other Points, to which I once again desire an answer without any of these or the like ambiguous terms, *in some sort*, *in some sense*, *in some degree*, which may be explicated afterward, as strictly or largely as may best serve his turn; but let him tell us roundly and particularly, in what sort, in what sense, in what degree he understands those, and the like obscure mincing phrases.

If

If he proceed ſolidly after this manner, and not by way of meer words, more like a Preacher to a vulgar Auditor, than like a learned man with a pen in his hand, thy patience ſhall be the leſs abuſed, and truth will alſo receive more right. And ſince we have already laid the grounds of the queſtion, much may be ſaid hereafter in few words, if (as I ſaid) he keep cloſe to the real point of every difficulty without wandring into impertinent diſputes, or multiplying vulgar and thred-bare objections and arguments, or labouring to prove what no man denies, or making a vain oſtentation by citing a number of Schoolmen, which every Puny brought up in Schools is able to do; and if he cite his Authors with ſuch ſincerity, as no time need be ſpent in opening his corruptions; and finally, if he ſet himſelf awork with this conſideration, that we are to give a moſt ſtrict account to a moſt juſt and impartial Judge, of every period, line, and word that paſſeth under our pen. For if at the latter day we ſhall be arraigned for every idle word which is ſpoken, ſo much more will that be done for every idle word which is written, as the deliberation wherewith it paſſeth makes a man guilty of more malice, and as the importance of the matter which is treated of in Books concerning true Faith and Religion, without which no Soul can be ſaved, makes a man's Errors more material, than they would be, if the queſtion were but of toys.

The Anſwer to the PREFACE.

AND 1. & 2. §. If beginnings be ominous (as they ſay they are,) D. *Potter* hath cauſe to look for great ſtore of uningenuous dealing from you; the very firſt words you ſpeak of him, *viz. That he hath not ſo much as once truly and really fallen upon the Point in queſtion*, being a moſt unjuſt and immodeſt imputation.

2. For firſt; The Point in queſtion, was not that which you pretend, *Whether both Papiſts and Proteſtants can be ſaved in their ſeveral Profeſſions?* But, *Whether you may without uncharitableneſs affirm that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* And that this is the very queſtion, is moſt apparent and unqueſtionable, both from the title of *Charity Miſtaken*, and from the Arguments of the three firſt Chapters of it, and from the title of your own Reply. And therefore if D. *Potter* had joyned iſſue with his Adverſary only thus far; and, not medling at all with *Papiſts*, but leaving them to *ſtand or fall to their own Maſter*, had proved *Proteſtants* living and dying ſo, *capable of Salvation*; I cannot ſee how it could juſtly be charged upon him, that he *had not once truly and really fallen upon the Point in Queſtion*. Neither may it be ſaid that your Queſtion here and mine, are in effect the ſame, ſeeing it is very poſſible that the true Anſwer to the one might have been Affirmative, and to the other Negative. For there is no incongruity, but it may be true *That You and We cannot both be ſaved*: And yet as true, *That without uncharitableneſs you cannot pronounce us damned*. For, all ungrounded and unwarrantable ſentencing men to Damnation, is either in a proriety of ſpeech uncharitable, or elſe (which for my purpoſe is all one,) it is that which Proteſtants mean, when they ſay, Papiſts for damning them are uncharitable. And therefore though the *Author of C. M.* had proved as ſtrongly as he hath done weakly, *that one Heaven could not receive Proteſtants and Papiſts both*; yet certainly, it was very haſtily and unwarrantably, and therefore uncharitably concluded, that Proteſtants were the part that was to be excluded. As, though Jews and Chriſtians cannot both be ſaved, yet a Jew cannot juſtly, and therefore not charitably, pronounce a Chriſtian damned.

3. But then secondly, to shew your dealing with him very injurious; I say, he doth speak to this very Question very largely, and very effectually; as by confronting his Work and *Charity M.* together, will presently appear. *Charity M.* proves, you say, in general, *That there is but one Church.* D. *Potter* tels him, *His labour is lost in proving the unity of the Catholique Church, whereof there is no doubt or controversie*: and herein, I hope, you will grant he answers right and to the purpose. *C.M.* proves (you say) secondly, *That all Christians are obliged to hearken to the Church.* D. *Potter answers, It is true: yet not absolutely in all things, but only when she commands those things which God doth not countermand.* And this also, I hope, is to his purpose, though not to yours. *C.M.* proves, you say, thirdly, *That the Church must be ever visible and infallible.* For her *Visibility*, D. *Potter* denies it not; and as for her *Infallibility*, he grants it in *Fundamentals*, but *not in Superstructures.* *C.M.* proves, you say, fourthly, *That to separate one's self from the Churche's Communion, is Schism.* D. *Potter* grants it, with this exception, *unless there be necessary cause to do so*; unless the conditions of her Communion be apparently unlawful. *C.M.* proves, you say, lastly, *That to dissent from her Doctrine is Heresie, though it be in points never so few, and never so small, and therefore that the distinction of points fundamental and unfundamental, as it is applyed by Protestants, is wholly vain.* This D. *P.* denies; shews the Reasons brought for it, weak and unconcluding; proves the contrary, by Reasons unanswerable: and therefore that *The distinction of points into fundamental and not-fundamental, as it is applyed by Protestants, is very good.* Upon these grounds you say, *C.M.* clearly evinces, *That any least difference in faith cannot stand with salvation, and therefore seeing Catholiques and Protestants disagree in very many points of faith, they both cannot hope to be saved without Repentance*, you must mean, without an explicite and particular repentance, and dereliction of their errors; for so *C.M.* hath declared himself p. 14. where he hath these words, *We may safely say that a man who lives in Protestancy, and who is so far from Repenting it, as that he will not so much as acknowledge it to be a sin, though he be sufficiently enformed thereof*, &c. From whence it is evident, that in his judgement there can be no repentance of an errour, without acknowledging it to be a sin. And to this D. *Potter* justly opposes: *That both Sides, by the confession of both Sides, agree in more points than are simply and indispensably necessary to Salvation, and differ only in such as are not precisely necessary: That it is very possible, a man may die in error, and yet die with Repentance, as for all his sins of ignorance, so, in that number, for the errors in which he dies; with a repentance though not explicite and particular which is not simply required, yet implicit and general which is sufficient: so that he cannot but hope, considering the goodness of God, that the truth is retained on both Sides: especially those, of the necessity of Repentance from dead Works and Faith in Jesus Christ, if they be put in practice, may be an Antidote against the errors held on either Side; to such he means, and says, as being diligent in seeking truth, and desirous to find it, yet miss of it through humane frailty, and die in errour.* If you will but attentively consider and compare the undertaking of *C. M.* and D. *Potter's* performance in all these points, I hope, you will be so ingenuous as to acknowledge, that you have injured him much, in imputing tergiversation to him, and pretending that *through his whole Book he hath not once truly and really fallen upon the Point in Question.*

Neither

Neither may you or *C. M.* conclude him from hence (as covertly you do) *An enemy to ſouls by deceiving them with ungrounded falſe hopes of Salvation*; ſeeing the hope of ſalvation cannot be ungrounded, which requires and ſuppoſes belief and practice of all things abſolutely neceſſary unto ſalvation, and repentance of thoſe ſins and errours which we fall into by humane frailty: Nor *a friend to indifferency in Religions*, ſeeing he gives them only hope of pardon of Errours who are deſirous, and, according to the proportion of their opportunities and abilities, induſtrious to find the truth; or at leaſt truly repentant, that they have not been ſo. Which Doctrine is very fit to excite men to a conſtant and impartial ſearch of truth, and very far from teaching them that it is indifferent what Religion they are of; and, without all controverſie, very honourable to the Goodneſs of God, with which how it can conſiſt, not to be ſatisfied with his ſervant's true endeavours to know his will, and do it, without full and exact performance, I leave it to you and all good men to judge.

4. As little juſtice me-thinks you ſhew, in quarrelling with him for deſcending to the particular diſputes here mentioned by you. For to ſay nothing that many of theſe Queſtions are immediately and directly pertinent to the buſineſs in hand, as the 1, 2, 3, 5, 6. and all of them fall in of themſelves into the ſtream of his Diſcourſe, and are not drawn in by him, and beſides are touched for the moſt part, rather than handled; to ſay nothing of all this, you know right well, if he conclude you erroneous in any one of all theſe, be it but in the *Communion in one kind*, or the *Language of your ſervice*, the infallibility of your Church is evidently overthrown: And this being done, I hope, there will be *no ſuch neceſsity of hearkening to her in all things: It will be very poſsible to ſeparate from her communion in ſome things, without Schiſm; and from her Doctrine, ſo far as it is erroneous, without Hereſie: Then all that ſhe propoſes will not be*, eo ipſo, *fundamental, becauſe ſhe propoſes it:* and ſo preſently all *Charity Miſtaken* will vaniſh into ſmoak, and clouds, and nothing.

5. You ſay *he was loth to affirm plainly, that generally both Catholiques and Proteſtants may be ſaved*: which yet is manifeſt he doth affirm plainly, of Proteſtants throughout his Book; and of erring Papiſts that have *ſincerely ſought the truth, and failed of it, and die with a general repentance*, p. 77, 78. And yet you deceive your ſelf if you conceive he had any other neceſſity to do ſo, but only that he thought it true. For we may and do pretend that before *Luther there were many true Churches, beſides, the Roman*, which agreed not with her: in particular, *The Greek Church*. So that what you ſay is evidently true, is indeed evidently falſe. Beſides, if he had had any neceſſity to make uſe of you in this matter, he needed not for this end to ſay that now in your Church Salvation may be had, but only that before *Lurhers* time it might be: Then when your means of knowing the Truth were not ſo great, and when your ignorance might be more invincible, and therefore more excuſable. So that you may ſee, if you pleaſe, it is not for ends, but for the love of truth, that we are thus charitable to you.

6. Neither is it material that theſe particulars he ſpeaks againſt, are not *fundamental errours*; for though they be not *deſtructive of ſalvation*, yet the convincing of them may be, and is, *deſtructive enough of his Adverſarie's aſſertion*: and if you be the man I take you for, you will not deny they are ſo. For certainly, no Conſequence can be more palpable than this;

The Church of *Rome* doth err in this or that, therefore it is not infallible. And this perhaps you perceived your self, and therefore demanded not, *Since they be not fundamental, what imports it whether we hold them or no?* simply: But, *for as much as concerns our possibility to be saved.* As if we were not bound by the love of God and the love of Truth to be zealous in the defence of all Truths, that are any way profitable, though not simply necessary to salvation! Or, as if any good man could satisfie his conscience without being so affected and resolved! Our Saviour himself having assured us, * That *he that shall break one of his least Commandments* (some whereof you pretend are concerning venial sins, and consequently the keeping of them not necessary to salvation) *and shall so teach men, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven.*

* Mat. 5. 19.

7. But then it imports very much, though not for the *possibility that you may be saved*, yet for the *probability that you will be so*: because the holding of these errors, though it did not *merit*, might yet *occasion* damnation. As the doctrine of Indulgences may take away the fear of Purgatory, and the doctrine of Purgatory the fear of Hell; as you well know it does too frequently. So that though a godly man might be saved *with these* errours, yet *by means of them*, many are made vicious, and so damned. *By them* I say, though *not for them.* No godly Layman who is verily perswaded that there is neither impiety nor superstition in the use of your Latine-service, shall be damned, I hope, for being present at it; yet the want of that devotion which the frequent hearing the Offices understood, might happily beget in them, the want of that instruction and edification which it might afford them, may very probably hinder the salvation of many which otherwise might have been saved. Besides, though the matter of an Errour may be only something profitable, not necessary, yet the neglect of it may be a damnable sin; As, not to regard venial sins is in the Doctrine of your Schools, mortal. Lastly, as venial sins, you say, dispose men to mortal; so the erring from some profitable, though lesser truth, may dispose a man to errour in greater matters. As for example: The belief of the Pope's infallibility is, I hope, not unpardonably damnable to every one that holds it; yet if it be a falshood (as most certainly it is) it puts a man into a very congruous disposition to believe *Antichrist*, if he should chance to get into that See.

8. *Ad §. 3. In his Distinction of, point fundamental and not fundamental, he may seem*, you say, *to have touched the point, but does not so indeed. Because though he says, There are some points so fundamental, as that all are obliged to believe them explicitely, yet he tels you not, whether a man may disbelieve any other points of faith, which are sufficiently presented to his understanding, as Truths revealed by Almighty God.* Touching which matter of *Sufficient Proposal*, I beseech you to come out of the clouds, and tell us roundly and plainly, what you mean by *Points of faith sufficiently propounded to a man's understanding, as Truths revealed by God.* Perhaps you mean such, as the person to whom they are proposed, understands sufficiently to be Truths revealed by God. But how then can he possibly choose but believe them? Or how is it not an apparent contradiction, that a man should disbelieve what himself understands to be a Truth; or any Christian what he understands or but believes to be testified by God? Doctor *Potter* might well think it superfluous to tell you *This is damnable*; because

indeed

indeed it is impoſſible. And yet one may very well think, by your ſaying, as you do hereafter, *That the impiety of hereſie conſiſts in calling God's truth in queſtion*, that this ſhould be your meaning. Or do you eſteem all thoſe things *ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as Divine truths*, which by you, or any other man, or any Company of men whatſoever, are declared to him to be ſo? I hope you will not ſay ſo: for this were to oblige a man to believe all the Churches, and all the men in the world, whenſoever they pretend to propoſe Divine Revelations. D. *Potter*, I aſſure you from him, would never have told you this neither. Or do you mean by *ſufficiently propounded as Divine Truths*, all that your Church propounds for ſuch? That you may not, neither; For the Queſtion between us, is this; *Whether your Churches Propoſition be a ſufficient Propoſition?* And therefore to ſuppoſe this, is to ſuppoſe the Queſtion; which you know in Reaſoning is always a fault. Or laſtly, do you mean (for I know not elſe what poſſibly you can mean,) by *ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as revealed by God*; that which, all things conſidered, is ſo propoſed to him, that he might and ſhould and would believe it to be true and revealed by God, were it not for ſome voluntary and avoidable fault of his own that interpoſeth it ſelf between his underſtanding and the truth preſented to it? This is the beſt conſtruction that I can make of your words; and if you ſpeak of truths thus propoſed and rejected, let it be as damnable, as you pleaſe, to deny or disbelieve them. But then I cannot but be amaz'd to hear you ſay, That D. *Potter never tells you whether there be any other Points of faith, beſides thoſe which we are bound to believe explicitely, which a man may deny or disbelieve, though they be ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as truths revealed or teſtified by Almighty God*; ſeeing the light it ſelf is not more clear than D. *Potter*'s Declaration of himſelf for the Negative in this Queſtion. p. 245, 246, 247, 249, 250. of his Book. Where he treats at large of this very Argument, beginning his diſcourſe thus. "*It ſeems fundamental to the faith,* "*and for the ſalvation of every member of the Church, that he acknow-*"*ledge and believe all ſuch points of faith, as whereof he may be convin-*"*ced that they belong to the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt.* To this conviction "he requires three things; *Clear Revelation, Sufficient Propoſition, and* "*Capacity and Underſtanding in the Hearer. For want of clear Revelation,* "*he frees the Church before Chriſt and the Diſciples of Chriſt, from any* "*damnable errour, though they believed not thoſe things, which he that* "*ſhould now deny, were no Chriſtian. To Sufficient Propoſition, he requires* "*two things*: 1. *That the points be perſpicuouſly laid open in themſelves.* "2. *So forcibly, as may ſerve to remove reaſonable doubts to the contrary, and* "*to ſatisfie a teachable mind concerning it, againſt the principles in which he* "*hath been bred to the Contrary. This Propoſition, he ſays, is not limited to the* "*Pope or Church, but extended to all means whatſoever, by which a man may* "*be convinced in conſcience, that the matter propoſed is divine Revelati-*"*on; which he profeſſes to be done ſufficiently, not only when his conſcience* "*doth expreſly bear witneſs to the truth; but when it would do ſo, if it were* "*not choaked, and blinded by ſome unruly and unmortified luſt in the will.* "*The difference being not great between him that is wilfully blind, and him* "*that knowingly gainſayeth the Truth. The third thing he requires, is Ca-*"*pacity and Ability to apprehend the Propoſal, and the Reaſons of it: the*

"*want*

" *want whereof excuſeth fools and madmen, &c. But where there is no* " *ſuch impediment, and the will of God is ſufficiently propounded, there* " (ſaith he) *he that oppoſeth is convinced of errour; and he who is thus* " *convinced, is an Heretique; and hereſie is a work of the Fleſh which ex-* " *cludeth from ſalvation,* (he means without Repentance). *And hence it* " *followeth, that it is fundamentall to a Chriſtian's faith, and neceſſary for* " *his ſalvation, that he believe all revealed truths of God, whereof he may* " *be convinced that they are from God.* This is the concluſion of Doctor *Potter*'s diſcourſe; many paſſages whereof you take notice of in your ſubſequent diſputations, and make your advantage of them. And therefore I cannot but ſay again, that it amazeth me to hear you ſay, that he declines this Queſtion, and never tells you *whether or no there be any other points of faith, which being ſufficiently propounded as divine Revelations may be denied and diſ-believed.* He tells you plainly, there are none ſuch: and therefore you cannot ſay, that he tells you not whether there be any ſuch. Again, it is almoſt as ſtrange to me, why you ſhould ſay, this was the only thing in queſtion, *Whether a man may deny or disbelieve any point of faith, ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as a truth revealed by God.* For to ſay that any thing is a thing in queſtion, me-thinks, at the firſt hearing of the words, imports, that it is by ſome affirmed, and denied by others. Now you affirm, I grant; but, What Proteſtant ever denied, that it was a ſin, to give God the lye? Which is the firſt and moſt obvious ſenſe of theſe words. Or, which of them ever doubted, that to disbelieve is then a fault, when the matter is ſo propoſed to a man, that he might and ſhould, and, were it not for his own fault, would believe it? Certainly, he that queſtions either of theſe, juſtly deſerves to have his wits called in queſtion. Produce any one Proteſtant that ever did ſo, and I will give you leave to ſay, It is the only thing in queſtion. But then I muſt tell you, that your enſuing Argument, *viz. To deny a truth witneſſed by God is damnable, But of two that diſagree one muſt of neceßity deny ſome ſuch truth, Therefore one only can be ſaved*; is built upon a ground clean different from this poſtulate. For though it be always a fault to deny what either I do know, or ſhould know, to be teſtified by *God*; yet that which by a cleanly conveyance you put in the place hereof, *To deny a truth witneſſed by God* ſimply, without the circumſtance of *being known or ſufficiently propoſed*, is ſo far from being certainly damnable, that it may be many times done without any the leaſt fault at all. As if God ſhould teſtifie ſomething to a man in the *Indies*, I that had no aſſurance of this teſtification ſhould not be oblig'd to believe it. For in ſuch caſes the Rule of the Law hath place, *Idem eſt non eſſe & non apparere*: not to be at all and not to appear to me, is to me all one. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto you* (ſaith our Saviour) *you had had no ſin.*

10. As little neceſſity is there for that which follows: *That of two diſagreeing in a matter of faith, one muſt deny ſome ſuch truth.* Whether by [*ſuch*] you underſtand, *Teſtified at all by God*; or, *teſtified and ſufficiently propounded.* For it is very poſſible the matter in controverſie may be ſuch a thing wherein God hath not at all declared himſelf, or not ſo fully and clearly, as to oblige all men to hold one way; and yet be ſo overvalued by the parties in variance, as to be eſteemed a matter *of faith*, and one of thoſe things of which our Savior ſays, *He that believeth not ſhall be damn'd.*

Who

Who ſees not that it is poſſible, two Churches may excommunicate and damn each other for keeping Chriſtmaſs ten dayes ſooner or later; as well as *Victor* excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia*, for differing from him about *Eaſter* day? And yet I believe you will confeſs, that God had not then declared himſelf about *Eaſter*, nor hath now about *Chriſtmaſs*. Anciently ſome good Catholique Biſhops excommunicated and damned others for *holding there were Antipodes*: and in this queſtion I would fain know on which ſide was the ſufficient propoſal. *The contra-Remonſtrants* differ from the *Remonſtrants* about the point of Predetermination as a matter of faith: I would know in this thing alſo, which way God hath declared himſelf; whether for Predetermination or againſt it. *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* held it as a matter of faith and Apoſtolique Tradition, *That Heretiques gave true Baptiſm*: Others there were, and they as good Catholiques as he, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith*, nor matter of *Truth*. *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, held the doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *faith*: and though *Juſtin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirm, that ſome good Chriſtians held the contrary. S. *Auguſtine*, I am ſure, held *the communicating of Infants* as much Apoſtolique tradition, as the *Baptizing* of them: whether the Biſhop and the Church of *Rome* of his time, held ſo too, or held otherwiſe, I deſire you to determine. But, ſure I am, the Church of *Rome* at this preſent holds the contrary. The ſame S. *Auſtin*, held it no matter of faith that the *Biſhops of* Rome *were Judges of Appeals* from all parts of the Church Catholique, no not in *Major Cauſes* and *Major Perſons*: whether the Biſhop or Church of *Rome* did then hold the contrary, do you reſolve me; but now I am reſolv'd, they do ſo. In all theſe differences, the point in queſtion is eſteemed and propoſed by one ſide at leaſt as a matter of *faith*, and by the other rejected, as not ſo: and either this is to diſagree in matters of faith, or you will have no means to ſhew that we do diſagree. Now then to ſhew you how weak and ſandy the foundation is, on which the whole fabrick both of your Book and Church depends, anſwer me briefly to this *Dilemma*. Either, in theſe oppoſitions, one of the oppoſite Parts erred damnably, and denied God's truth ſufficiently propounded; or they did not. If they did, then they which do deny God's truth ſufficiently propounded, may go to heaven; and then you are raſh and uncharitable in excluding us, though we were guilty of this fault. If not, then there is no ſuch neceſſity that of two diſagreeing about a matter of faith, one ſhould deny God's truth ſufficiently propounded. And ſo the Major and Minor of your Argument, are proved falſe. Yet though they were as true as Goſpel, and as evident as Mathematical Principles, the Concluſion (ſo impertinent is it to the Premiſes) might ſtill be falſe. For that which naturally iſſues from theſe Propoſitions is not, *Therefore one only can be ſaved*: But, *Therefore one of them does ſomething that is damnable*. But, with what Logick, or what Charity you can inferr either as the immediate production of the former premiſes, or as a Corollary from this Concluſion, *Therefore one only can be ſaved*, I do not underſtand; unleſs you will pretend that this conſequence is good, Such a one doth ſomething damnable, therefore he ſhall certainly be damned: Which whether it be not to overthrow the Article of our Faith, which promiſes *remiſſion of ſins* upon repentance; and conſequently, to ruine the Goſpel

of

of Christ, I leave it to the Pope and the Cardinals to determine. For if against this it be alleaged, that no man can repent of the sin wherein he dies: This muce I have already stopped, by shewing, that if it be a sin of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

11. *Ad* §. 4. You proceed in sleighting and disgracing your Adversary, *Pretending his objections are mean and vulgar, and such as have been answered a thousand times.* But if your cause were good, these Arts would be needless. For though some of his Objections have been often shifted, by men * that make a profession of devising shifts and evasions to save themselves and their Religion from the pressure of truth, by men that are resolved they will say somthing, though they can say nothing to purpose; yet I doubt not to make it apppear, that neither by others have they been truly and really satisfied; and that the best Answer you give them, is to call them, *Mean and vulgar objections.*

* I mean the Divines of *Doway*: whose profession we have in your *Belgick Expurgatorius* p. 12. *in censura Bertrami*, in these words: *Seeing in other ancient Catholiques, we tolerate, extenuate, and excuse very many errors, and devising some shift often deny them, and put upon them a convenient sense when they are objected to us in disputations and conflicts with our Adversaries; we see no reason why* Bertram *may not deserve the same equity.*

12. *Ad* §. 5. *But this pains might have been spared: For the substance of his Discourse is in a Sermon of D.* Ushers, *and confuted four years ago by Paulus Veridicus.* It seems then, the substance of your Reply is in *Paulus Veridicus*, and so your pains also might well have deen spared. But had there been no necessity to help and peece out your confuting his Arguments with disgracing his Person, (which yet you cannot do) you would have considered, that to them who compare D. *Potters* Book, and the Arch-Bishops Sermon, this asperson will presently appear a poor Detraction, not to be answered, but scorned. To say nothing, that in D. *Potter*, being to answer a Book by expres Command from Royal Authority, to leave any thing material unsaid, because it had been said before, especially being spoken at large, and without any relation to the Discourse which he was to Answer, had been a ridiculous vanity and foul prevarication.

13. *Ad* §. 6. In your sixth *Parag.* I let all pass saving only this, *That a perswasion that men of different Religions* (you must mean, or else you speak not to the point, Christians of divers Opinions and Communions) *may be saved, is a most pernitious Heresie, and even a ground of Atheism.* What strange extractions Chymistry can make, I know not; but sure I am, he that by reason would inferr this Conclusion, *That there is no God*; from this ground, *That God will save men in different Religions*, must have a higher strain in Logick, than you or I have hitherto made shew of. In my apprehension, the other part of the Contradiction, *That there is a God*, should much rather follow from it. And whether Contradictions will flow from the same fountain, let the Learned judge. Perhaps you will say, You intended not to deliver here a positive and measured truth, and which you expected to be called to account for; but only a high and tragical expression of your just detestation of the wicked Doctrin against which you write. If you mean so, I shall let it pass: only I am to advertize the lesse-wary Reader, that, passionate Expressions, and vehement Asseverations are no Arguments; unless it be, of the weakness of the cause that is defended by them, or the man that defends it. And to remember you of what *Boethius* sayes of some such things as these, —*Nubila mens est, Hæc ubi regnant.* For my part, I am not now in passion; neither will I speak one word which I think I cannot justifie to the full: and I say, and will maintain, that to say, *That Christians of different Opinions and Communions* (*such I mean, who*

who hold all those things that are simply necessary to Salvation) may not obtain pardon for the Errors wherein they die ignorantly, by a general Repentance; is so far from being a ground of Atheism, that to say the contrary, is to crosse in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Gospel of Christ.

14. *Ad* §. 7, & 8. To the two next Parag. I have but two words to say. The one is, that I know no Protestants that *hold it necessary to be able to prove a Perpetual Visible Church distinct from Yours.* Some perhaps undertake to do so, as a matter of curtesie; but I believe you will be much to seek for any one that holds it necessary. For though you say, that Christ hath promised there shall de a perpetual Visible Church; yet you your selves do not pretend that he hath promised, there shall be Histories and Records alwayes extant of the professors of it in all ages: not that he hath any where enjoyned us to read those Histories, that we may be able to shew them.

15. The other is, That *Bretrelit's* great exactnesse, which you magnifie so, and amplifie, is no very certain demonstration of his fidelity. A Romance may be told with as much variety of circumstances, as a true Story.

16. *Ad* 9, & 10. §. Your desires that I would, in this rejoynder, *Avoid impertinencies: Not impose doctrins upon you which you disclaim: Set down the substance of your Reasons faithfully and entirely: Not weary the Reader with unnecessary Quotations: Object nothing to you which I can answer my self, or which may be returned upon my self: And lastly, (which you repeat again in the end of your Preface) speak as clearly and distinctly and univocally as possibly I can,* are all very reasonable, and shall be by me most punctually and fully satisfied. Only I have reason to complain, that you give us rules only, and no good example in keeping them. For in some of these things I shall have frequent occasion to shew, that *Medice, cura teipsum*, may very justly be said unto you; especially for objecting what might very easily have been answered by you, and may be very justly returned upon you.

17. To your ensuing demands, though some of them be very captious and ensnaring; yet I will give you as clear and plain ingenuous Answers as possibly I can.

18. *Ad* 11. §. To the first then, about *the Perpetuity of the visible Church*, my Answer is: That I believe our Saviour, ever since his Ascention, hath had in some place or other a Visible true Church on earth: I mean a Company of men, that professed at least so much truth as was absolutely necessary for their Salvation. And I believe that there will be somewhere or other such a Church to the Worlds end. But the contrary Doctrin, I do at no hand believe to be a damnable Heresie.

19. *Ad* §. 12. To the second, What *Visible Church there was before* Luther, *disagreeing from the* Roman? I answer, that before *Luther* there were many Visible Churches, in many things disagreeing from the *Roman:* But not that the whole Catholique Church disagreed from her, because she her self was a Part of the Whole, though much corrupted. And to undertake to name a Catholike Church disagreeing from her, is to make her no Part of it, which we do not, nor need not pretend. And *for men agreeing with Protestants in all points*, we will then produce them, when you shall either prove it necessary to be done, which you know we absolutely deny; or when you shall produce a perpetual succession of Professors, which in all points have agreed with you, and disagreed from you in nothing. But this

my

my promise, to deal plainly with you, I conceive, and so intended it to be very like his, who undertook to drink up the Sea, upon condition, that he to whom the promise was made, should first stop the Rivers from running in. For this unreasonable request which you make to us, is to your selves so impossible, that in the very next Age after the Apostles, you will never be able to name a man, whom you can prove to have agreed with you in all things, nay (if you speak of such, whose Works are extant and unquestioned) whom we cannot prove to have disagreed from you in many things. Which I am so certain of, that I will venture my credit, and my life upon it.

20. *Ad §.* 13. To the third, *Whether, seeing there cannot be assigned any visible true Church distinct from the* Roman, *it follows not that she erred not fundamentally?* I say, in our sense of the word *Fundamental*, it does follow. For, if it be true, that there was then no Church distinct from the *Roman*, then it must be, either because there was no Church at all, which we deny: Or because the *Roman* Church was the whole Church, which we also deny: Or because she was a Part of the Whole, which we grant. And if she were a true part of the Church, then she retained those truths which were simply necessary to Salvation, and held no errours which were inevitably and unpardonably destructive of it. For this is precisely necessary to constitute any man or any Church a member of the Church Catholique. In our sense therefore of the word *Fundamental*, I hope she erred not fundamentally: but in your sense of the word, I fear she did: that is, she held something to be Divine Revelation, which was not; something not to be, which was.

21. *Ad §.* 14. To the fourth. *How it could be damnable to maintain her Errors, if they were not fundamental?* I answer. 1. Though it were not damnable, yet if it were a fault, it was not to be done. For a Venial sin with you is not damnable; yet you say, it is not to be committed for the procuring any good. *Non est faciendum malum vel minimum, ut eveniat bonum vel maximum.* 2. It is damnable to maintain an error against conscience, though the error in it self, and to him that believes it, be not damnable. Nay the profession not only of an error, but even of a truth, if not believed, when you think on it again, I believe you will confess to be a mortal sin; unless you will say, Hypocrisie and Simulation in Religion is not so. 3. Though we say, the Errors of the *Roman* Church were not destructive of Salvation, but pardonable even to them that died in them, upon a general repentance: yet we deny not but in *themselves they were damnable.* Nay, the very saying they were pardonable, implies they needed pardon, and therefore in themselves were damnable: damnable *meritoriously*, though not *effectually*. As a poyson may be deadly in it self, and yet not kill him, that together with the Poyson takes an Antidote: or as Felony may deserve death, and yet not bring it on him that obtains the Kings Pardon.

22. *Ad §.* 15. To the fifth. *How they can be excused from Schism, who forsook her Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable!* I answer. All that we forsake in you, is only the belief, and practice, and profession of your Errors. Hereupon you cast us out of your Communion. And then with a strange, and contradictious, and ridiculous hypocrisie, complain that we forsake it. As if a man should thrust his friend out of doors, and then be offended at his departure. But for us not to forsake the belief of your Errors, having discovered them to be Errors, was impossible; and therefore to do so could not be damnable, believing them to be Errors. Not to forsake

ſake the practice and profeſſion of them, had been damnable hypocriſie; ſuppoſing that (which you vainly run away with, and take for granted) thoſe Errors in themſelves were not damnable. Now to do ſo, and, as matters now ſtand, not to forſake your Communion, is apparently contradictious: ſeeing the condition of your Communion is, that we muſt profeſs to believe all your Doctrins not only to be damnable Errors (which will not content you,) but alſo to be certain and neceſſary and revealed Truths. So that to demand, Why we forſake your Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable, is, in effect, to demand why we forſook it upon our forſaking it! For to pretend that there are Errors in your Church though not damnable, is *ipſo facto*, to forſake your Communion and to do that which both in your account, and, as you think, in Gods account, puts him that does ſo, out of your Communion. So that either you muſt free your Church, from requiring the beliefe of any Error whatſoever, damnable and not damnable; or, whether you will or no, you muſt free us from Schiſm. For Schiſm there cannot be, in leaving your Communion, unleſs we were obliged to continue in it. Man cannot be obliged by Man, but to what either formally or vertually he is obliged by God; for, all juſt power is from God. God the Eternal Truth neither can nor will oblige us to believe any the leaſt and the moſt innocent falſhood to be a Divine truth, that is, to erre; nor, to profeſs a known Error, which is to lie. So that if you require the beliefe of any Error among the conditions of your Communion, our Obligation to communicate with you ceaſeth, and ſo the imputation of Schiſm to us vaniſheth into nothing; but lies heavy upon you for, making our ſeparation from you juſt and neceſſary, by requiring unneceſſary and unlawful conditions of your Communion. Hereafter therefore, I intreat you, let not your demand be, How could we forſake your Communion without Schiſm, ſeeing you erred not damnably? But, How we could do ſo without Schiſm, ſeeing you erred not at all? which if either you do prove, or we cannot diſprove it, we will (I at leaſt will for my part) return to your Communion, or ſubſcribe my ſelf Schiſmatique. In the mean time, μένομεν ὥσπερ ἐσμέν.

23. Yet notwithſtanding all your Errors, we do not renounce your Communion *totally* and abſolutely, but only leave Communicating with you in the practice and profeſſion of your Errors. The tryal whereof will be to propoſe ſome form of worſhipping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and herein if we refuſe to joyn with you, then, and not till then, may you juſtly ſay, We have utterly and abſolutely abandoned your Communion.

24. *Ad* §. 16. Your ſixth demand I have already ſatisfied in my Anſwers to the *Second* and the *Fourth*: and in my Reply, *ad* §. 2. toward the end. And though you ſay, *your repeating muſt be excuſed*, yet I dare not be ſo confident, and therefore forbear it.

25. *Ad* §. 17. To the ſeventh, *Whether error againſt any one truth ſufficiently propounded as teſtified by God, deſtroy not the Nature and Unity of faith, or, at leaſt, is not a grievous offence excluding ſalvation?* I anſwer; If you ſuppoſe, as you ſeem to do, the propoſition ſo ſufficient, that the party to whom it is made is convinced that it is from God, ſo that the denial of it involves alſo with it the denial of Gods veracity; any ſuch Error deſtroys both faith and ſalvation. But if the Propoſal be only ſo ſufficient, not, that the party to whom it is made is convinced, but only that he ſhould, and, but for his own fault, would have been convinced of the Divine Verity of the Doctrin propoſed:

posed: The crime then is not so great; for, the belief of Gods Veracity may well consist with such an Error. Yet a fault I confess it is, and (without Repentance) damnable, if, all circumstances considered, the Proposal be sufficient. But then I must tell you, that the Proposal of the present *Roman* Church is only pretended to be sufficient for this purpose, but is not so: especially all the Rayes of the Divinity, which they pretend to shine so conspicuously in her Proposals, being so darkned and even extinguished with a cloud of contradiction, from Scripture, Reason, and the Ancient Church.

26. *Ad Q.* 18. To the Eighth, *How of disagreeing protestants, both parts may hope for salvation, seeing some of them must needs err against some Truth testified by God?* I answer, The most disagreeing Protestants that are, yet thus far agree; 1. That those Books of Scripture which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted Word of God, and a perfect rule of faith. 2. That the sense of them, which God intended, whatsoever it is, is certainly true. So that they believe implicitely even those very Truths against which they err; and, Why an implicite faith in Christ and his Word, should not suffice as well as an implicite faith in your Church? I have desired to be resolved by many of your Side, but never could. 3. That they are to use their best endevours to believe the Scriptture in the true sense, and to live according to it. This if they perform (as I hope many on all Sides do) truly and sincerely, it is impossible but that they should believe aright in all things necessary to salvation; that is, in all those things which appertain to the Covenant between God and man in Christ; for so much, is not only plainly, but frequently, contained in Scripture. And believing aright touching the Covenant, if they for their parts perform the condition required of them, which is sincere obedience, Why should they not expect that God will perform his promise and give them salvation? For, as for other things which lie without the Covenant, and are therefore lesse necessary, if by reason of the seeming conflict which is oftentimes between Scripture and Reason, and Authority on the one Side; and Scripture, Reason, and Authority on the other; if by reason of the variety of tempers, abilities, educations, and unavoidable prejudices, whereby mens understandings are variously formed and fashioned, they do embrace several Opinions, whereof some must be erroneous; to say that God will damn them for such Errors, who are lovers of Him, and lovers of Truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodness; it is to make Man desperate, and God a Tyrant. ***But they deny Truths testified by God, and therefore shall be damned.*** Yes, if they knew them to be thus testified by him and yet would deny them, that were to give God the lie, and questionless damnable. But if you should deny a truth which God had testified, but only to a man in the *Indies*, (as I said before), and this testification you had never heard of, or at least had no sufficient reason to believe that God had so testified, Would not you think it a hard case to be damned for such a denial? Yet consider, I pray, a little more attentively the difference between them, and you will presently acknowledge, the question between them is not at any time, or in any thing, Whether God says true or no? or, Whether he says this or no? But, supposing he says this, and says true, Whether he means this or no? As for example: Between *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and *Zwinglians*, it is agreed that Christ spake these words, ***This is my Body***; and that, whatsoever he meant in saying so is true:

true: But what he meant and how he is be underſtood, that is the queſtion. So that though ſome of them deny a Truth by God intended, yet you can with no Reaſon or Juſtice accuſe them of denying the truth of Gods Teſtimony, unleſs you can plainly ſhew that God hath declared, and that plainly and clearly, what was his meaning in theſe words. I ſay, *plainly and clearly*. For he that ſpeaks obſcurely and ambiguouſly, and no where declares himſelf plainly, ſure he hath no reaſon to be much offended if he be miſtaken. When therefore you can ſhew, that in this and all other their Controverſies, God hath interpoſed his Teſtimony on one Side or other; ſo that either they do ſee it, and will not; or, were it not for their own voluntary and avoidable fault, might and ſhould ſee it and do not; let all ſuch Errors be as damnable as you pleaſe to make them. In the mean while, if they ſuffer themſelves neither to be betraid into their Errors, nor kept in them by any ſin of their will; if they do their beſt endevour to free themſelves from all Errors, and yet fail of it through humane frailty; ſo well am I perſwaded of the goodneſs of God, that if in me alone, ſhould meet a confluence of all ſuch Errors of all the Proteſtants in the World, that were thus qualified, I ſhould not be ſo much afraid of them all, as I ſhould be to ask pardon for them. For, whereas that which you affright us with, of calling Gods Veracity in Queſtion, is but a Panick fear, a fault that no man thus qualified, is, or can be guilty of; to ask pardon of ſimple and purely involuntary Errors is tacitely to imply that God is angry with us for them, and that were to impute to him the ſtrange tyranny of *requiring brick, when he gives no ſtraw; of expecting to gather, where he ſtrewed not; to reap where he ſowed not*: of being offended with us for not doing what he knows we cannot do. This I ſay upon a ſuppoſition, that they do their beſt endevours to know Gods will and do it; which he that denies to be poſſible, knows not what he ſayes; for he ſayes in effect, That men cannot do, what they can do; for to do what a man can do, is to do his beſt endevour. But becauſe this Suppoſition, though certainly poſſible, is very rare, and admirable, I ſay, ſecondly, that I am verily perſwaded, that God will not impute errors to them as ſins, who uſe ſuch a meaſure of induſtry, in finding truth, as humane *prudence* and ordinary *diſcretion* (their abilities and opportunities, their diſtractions and hinderances, and all other things conſidered) ſhall adviſe them unto, in a matter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein alſo we fail, then our errors begin to be malignant, and juſtly imputable, as offences againſt God, and that love of his truth which he requires in us. You will ſay then, that for thoſe erring *Proteſtants*, which are in this caſe, which evidently are far the greater part, they ſin damnably in erring, and therefore there is little hope of their Salvation. To which I anſwer, that the conſequence of this Reaſon is ſomewhat ſtrong againſt a *Proteſtant*; but much weakned by coming out of the mouth of a *Papiſt*. For all ſins with you are not damnable; and therefore Proteſtants errors might be ſins, and yet not damnable. But yet out of courteſie to you, we will remove this rubbe out of your way; and for the preſent ſuppoſe them *mortal ſins*; and is there then no hope of Salvation for him that commits them? Not, you will ſay, if he die in them without repentance; and ſuch Proteſtants you ſpeak of, *Who without repentance die in their Errors*. Yea but what if they die in their errors with repentance? then I hope you will have Charity enough

In the place above quoted.

to think they may be saved. *Charity Mistaken* takes it indeed for granted, that this supposition is destructive of it self; and that it is impossible, and incongruous, that a man should repent of those errors wherein he dies; or die in those whereof he repents. But it was wisely done of Him to take it for granted; for most certainly, He could not have spoken one word of sense for the confirmation of it. For seeing *Protestants* believe, as well as you, God's infinite and most admirable perfections in himself, more than most worthy of all possible love: seeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodness to them, in creating them of nothing; in creating them according to his own Image; in creating all things for their use and benefit; in streaming down his favours on them every moment of their lives; in designing them, if they serve him, to infinite and eternal happiness; in redeeming them, not with corruptible things, but the precious blood of his beloved Son: seeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodness, and patience towards them, in expecting their Conversion; in wooing, alluring, leading, and by all means which his wisdom can suggest unto him, and man's nature is capable of, drawing them to Repentance and Salvation: Seeing they believe these things as well as you, and, for ought you know, consider them as much as you, (and if they do not, it is not their Religion, but They that are too blame) what can hinder, but that the consideration of God's most infinite goodness to them, and their own almost infinite wickedness against him, God's Spirit co-operating with them, may raise them to a true and sincere and a cordial love of God? And seeing sorrow for having injured or offended the person beloved, or when we fear we may have offended him, is the most natural effect of true love; what can hinder, but that love which hath oft-times constrained them to lay down their lives for God, (which, our Saviour assures us is the noblest sacrifice we can offer) may produce in them an universal sorrow for all their sins, both which they know they have committed, and which they fear they may have? In which number, their being negligent, or not dispassionate, or not unprejudicate enough in seeking the truth, and the effect thereof, their errors, if they be sins, cannot but be comprized. In a word, what should hinder, but that that Prayer —— *Delicta sua quis intelligit? Who can understand his faults? Lord, cleanse thou me from my secret sins*, may be heard and accepted by God, as well from a *Protestant* that dies in some errors, as from a *Papist* that dies in some other sins of Ignorance, which perhaps he might more easily have discovered to be sins, than a Protestant could his errors to be errors? As well from a Protestant, that held some error, which (as he conceived) God's word, and his reason, (which is also in some sort God's word) lead him unto; as from a *Dominican*, who perhaps took up his opinion upon trust, not because he had reason to believe it true, but because it was the Opinion of his *Order*; for the same man, if he had light upon another Order, would in all probability, have been of the other opinion: For what else is the cause, that generally *all the Dominicans are of one opinion, and all the Jesuits of the other?* I say, from a *Dominican* who took up his opinion upon trust; and that such an opinion (if we believe the Writers of your Order) as, if it be granted true, it were not a point-matter what opinions any man held, or what actions any man did; for the best would be as bad as the worst, and worst the as good as the best.

beſt. And yet ſuch is the partiality of your Hypocriſie, that, of diſagreing Papiſts, neither ſhall deny the truth teſtified by God, but both may hope for ſalvation: but, of diſagreeing Proteſtants (though they differ in the ſame thing,) one ſide muſt deny God's Teſtimony, and be incapable of ſalvation. That a *Dominican* through culpable negligence, living and dying in his error, may repent of it, though he knowes it not; or be ſaved, though he do not: But if a Proteſtant do the very ſame thing, in the very ſame point, and die in his error, his caſe is deſperate. The ſum of all that hath been ſaid to this Demand, is this. 1. That no erring Proteſtant denies any truth teſtified by God, under this formality, *as teſtified by him*; nor which they know or believe to be teſtified by him. And therefore it is an horrible calumny in you to ſay, *They call God's Veracity in queſtion.* For God's undoubted and unqueſtioned Veracity, is to them the ground why they hold all they do hold: neither do they hold any opinion ſo ſtiffly, but they will forgo it rather than this one, *That all which God ſays is true.* 2. God hath not ſo clearly and plainly declared himſelf in moſt of theſe things which are in Controverſie between Proteſtants, but that an honeſt man, whoſe heart is right to God, and one that is a true lover of God, and of his truth, may, by reaſon of the conflict of contrary Reaſons on both ſides, very eaſily, and therefore excuſably miſtake, and embrace error for truth, and reject truth for error. 3. If any Proteſtant or Papiſt be betrayed into, or kept in any Error, by any ſin of his will (as it is to be feared many millions are) ſuch Error is, as the cauſe of it, ſinful and damnable: yet not excluſive of all hope of Salvation, but pardonable, if diſcovered, upon a particular explicite repentance; if not diſcovered, upon a general and implicite Repentance for all Sins known and unknown: in which number all ſinful Errors muſt of neceſſity be contained.

17. *Ad* §. 19. *To the* 9. wherein you are ſo urgent for a *particular Catalogue of Fundamentals*: I anſwer almoſt in your own words, that we alſo conſtantly urge and require to have a particular Catalogue of your Fundamentals, whether they be written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church-Definitions, all which, you ſay, integrate the material Object of your Faith: In a word, of all ſuch Points as are defined and ſufficiently propoſed; ſo that whoſoever denies, or doubts of any of them, is certainly in the ſtate of damnation. A Catalogue I ſay in particular of the Propoſals: and not only ſome general definition, or deſcription, under which you lurk deceitfully, of what and what only is ſufficiently propoſed: wherein yet you do not very well agree. For many of you hold the Pope's propoſal *Ex Cathedra*, to be ſufficient and obliging: Some, a Councel without a Pope: Some, of neither of them ſeverally, but only both together: Some, not this neither in matter of manners, which *Bellarmine* acknowledges, and tell us, it is all one in effect, as if they denied it ſufficient in matter of faith: Some not in matter of faith neither think this propoſal infallible, without the acceptation of the Church univerſal: Some deny the infallibility of the Preſent Church: and only make the Tradition of all Ages the *infallible Propounder*. Yet if you were agreed, *what, and what only, is the infallible Propounder*, this would not ſatisfie us; nor yet to ſay *that All is Fundamental which is propounded ſufficiently by him.* For though agreeing in this, yet you might ſtill diſagree *whether ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine were propounded or not: or, if propounded, whether ſufficiently, or only unſufficiently.* And it is ſo known

This great diverſity of opinions among you, touching this matter, if any man doubt of it, let him read *Franciſcus Picus Mirandula in l. Theorem. in Expoſ. Theor. quarti*; & *Th. Waldenſis Tom. 3. De Sacramentalibus. doct. 3. fol. 5.* and he ſhall be fully ſatisfied that I have done you no injury.

known a thing, that in many Points you do so, that I assure my self you will not deny it. Therefore we constantly urge and require a particular and perfect Inventory of all those Divine Revelations, which, you say, *are sufficiently propounded; and that, such an one to which all of your Church will subscribe, as neither redundant, nor deficient*: which when you give in with one hand, you shall receive a particular Catalogue of such Points as I call *Fundamental*, with the other. Neither may you think me unreasonable in this Demand, seeing upon such a particular Catalogue of your sufficient Proposals as much depends, as upon a particular Catalogue of our Fundamentals. As for example; Whether or no a man do not err in some Point defined and sufficiently proposed: and, whether or no those that differ among you, differ in Fundamentals; which if they do, *One Heaven* (by your own Rule) *cannot receive them All*. Perhaps you will here complain, that this is not to satisfie your demand, but to avoid it, and to put you off, as the *Areopagites* did hard causes, *ad diem longissimum*, and bid you come again an hundred years hence. To deal truly, I did so intend it should be. Neither can you say my dealing with you is injurious, seeing I require nothing of you, but that, what you require of others, you should shew it possible to be done, and just and necessary to be required. For, for my part, I have great reason to suspect, it is neither the one nor the other. For whereas the Verities which are delivered in Scripture, may be very fitly divided into *such as were written because they were necessary to be believed*; (of which rank are those only, which constitute and make up the Covenant between God and Man in Christ): and then *such as are necessary to be believed not in themselves, but only by accident, because they were written*; Of which rank are many matters of History, of Prophecy, of Mysterie, of Policy, of Oeconomy, and such like, which are evidently not *intrinsecal* to the Covenant: Now, to sever exactly and punctually these Verities one from the other, what is *necessary in it self* and antecedently to the writing, from what is but only profitable in it self, and *necessary only because written*, is a business of extreme great difficulty, and extreme little necessity. For first, he that will go about to distinguish, especially in the Story of our Saviour, what was written because it was *profitable*, from what was written because *necessary*, shall find an intricate piece of business of it, and almost impossible that he should be certain he hath done it, when he hath done it. And then it is apparently unnecessary to go about it, seeing he that believes all, certainly believes all that is necessary; And he that doth not believe all (I mean all the undoubted parts of the undoubted Books of Scripture) can hardly believe any, neither have we reason to believe he doth so. So that, that Protestants give you not a Catalogue of Fundamentals, it is not from Tergiversation (as you suspect, who for want of Charity to them alwayes suspect the worst,) but from Wisdom and Necessity. For they may very easily err in doing it; because though all which is necessary be plain in Scripture, yet all which is plain, is not therefore written because it was necessary. For what greater necessity was there that I should know S. *Paul left his Cloak at Troas*, than those *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were never written. And when they had done it, it had been to no purpose; There being, as matters now stand, as great necessity of believing those Truths of Scripture which are not Fundamental, as those that are. You see then what reason we have to de-

decline this hard labour, which you a rigid Task-master have here put upon us. Yet instead of giving you a Catalogue of Fundamentals, with which I dare say you are resolved, before it come, never to be satisfied, I will say that to you, which, if you please, may do you as much service; and this it is: That it is sufficient for any man's Salvation that he believe the Scripture: that he endeavour to believe it in the true sense of it, as far as concerns his duty: And that he conform his life unto it either by Obedience or Repentance. He that does so (and all Protestants according to the *Dictam'n* of their Religion should do so) may be secure that he cannot err Fundamentally. And they that do so, cannot differ in Fundamentals. So that, notwithstanding their differences, and your presumption, *the same Heaven may receive them All.*

28. *Ad* §. 20. Your tenth and last request is, *to know distinctly what is the Doctrine of the Protestant English Church, in these Points; and what my private opinion.* Which shall be satisfied when the Church of *England* hath expressed her self in them; or when you have told us what is the Doctrine of your Church, in the Question of *Predetermination*, or the *Immaculate Conception.*

29. *Ad* 21, *&* 22. §. These answers, I hope, in the judgement of indifferent men are satisfactory to your Questions, though not to you, For I have either answered them, or given you a reason why I have not. Neither, for ought I can see, *have I flitted from things considered in their own nature, to accidental or rare Circumstances,* but told you my opinion plainly what I thought of your Errors in themselves: and what as they were qualified or malignified with good or bad circumstances. Though I must tell you truly, that I see no reason, the Question being of the damnableness of Error, *why you should esteem ignorance, incapacity, want of means to be instructed, accidental* and rare *Circumstances:* As if knowledge, capacity, having means of Instruction, concerning the truth of your Religion or ours, were not as rare and unusual in the adverse part of either, as Ignorance, Incapacity, and want of means of instruction. Especially how, erroneous Conscience can be a rare thing in those that err, or how unerring Conscience is not much more rare, I am not able to apprehend. So that to consider men of different Religions (the subject of this Controversie) in their own nature and *without circumstances*, must be to consider them, neither as ignorant, nor as knowing: neither as having, nor as wanting means of Instruction: neither as with Capacity, nor without it: neither with erroneous, nor yet with unerring conscience. And then what judgement can you pronounce of them, all the goodness and badness of an Action depending on the Circumstances? Ought not a Judge being to give sentence of an Action, to consider all the Circumstances of it? or is it possible he should judge rightly that doth not so? Neither is it to purpose, *That Circumstances being various, cannot be well comprehended under any general rule:* For though under any general rule they cannot, yet under many general rules they may, be comprehended. The Question here is, you say, *Whether men of different Religions may be saved?* Now the subject of this Question is an ambiguous term, and may be determined and invested with diverse and contrary Circumstances: and accordingly, contrary judgements are to be given of it. And who then can be offended with D. *Potter* for distinguishing before he defines, (the want whereof is the

chief

chief thing that makes defining dangerous?) Who can find fau't with him for saying, *If, through want of means of instruction, incapacity, invincible or probable ignorance a man die in error, he may be saved. But if he be negligent in seeking Truth, unwilling to find it, either doth see it and will not, or might see it and will not, that his case is dangerous, and without repentance desperate.* This is all that D. *Potter* says: neither rashly damning all that are of a different opinion from him, nor securing any that are in matter of Religion sinfully, that is, willingly erroneous. The Author of this Reply (I will abide by it) says the very same thing, neither can I see what adversary he hath in the main Question but his own shadow; and yet, I know not out of what frowardness, finds fault with D. *Potter* for affirming that which himself affirms: And to cloud the matter, whereas the Question is, *Whether men by ignorance, dying in error, may be saved*, he would have them considered *neither as erring, nor ignorant*. And when the question is, whether *The Errors of Papists be damnable*, to which we answer, That to them that do or might know them to be errors, they are damnable; to them that do not, they are not: He tels us that *this is to change the state of the Question*, whereas indeed it is to state the Question, and free it from ambiguity before you you answer it: *and to have recourse to Accidental Circumstances*; as if Ignorance were accidental to error, or as if a man could be considered as in error, and not be considered as in ignorance of the Truth from which he errs! Certainly, Error against a Truth, must needs presuppose a nescience of it: unless you will say that a man may at once resolve for a Truth and resolve against it; assent to it, and dissent from it; know it to be true, and believe it not to be true. Whether Knowledg and Opinion touching the same thing may stand together, is made a Question in the Schools: But he that would question, Whether knowing a thing and doubting of it, much more, whether knowing it to be true, and believing it to be false, may stand together, deserves without question no other Answer but laughter. Now if Error and Knowledge cannot consist, then Error and Ignorance must be inseparable. He then that professeth your errors may well be considered either as knowing or as Ignorant. But him that does err indeed, you can no more conceive without ignorance, than Long without Quantity, Vertuous without Quality, a Man and not a living Creature, to have gone ten miles, and not to have gone five, to speak sense and not to speak. For as the latter in all these is implyed in the former, so is Ignorance of a Truth, supposed in Error against it. Yet such a man, though not conceivable without ignorance simply, may be very well considered either as with, or without voluntary and sinful Ignorance. And he that will give a wise answer to this Question, Whether a Papist dying a Papist may be saved, according to God's ordinary proceeding; must distinguish him according to these several considerations, and say, He may be saved, If his Ignorance were either invincible, or at least unaffected and probable: if otherwise, without repentance he cannot.

To the rest of this Preface, I have nothing to say, saving what hath been said, but this, That it is no just exception to an argument to call it vulgar and thred-bare. Truth can neither be too common nor super-annuated, nor Reason ever worn out. Let your Answers be solid and pertinent, and we will never finde fault with them for being old or common.

The First Part.

Chap. I.

The State of the Question; with a ſummary of the Reaſons for which, amongſt men of different Religions, one Side only can be ſaved.

NEver is malice more indiſcreet, than when it chargeth others with imputation of that, to which it ſelf becomes more liable, even by that very act of accuſing others. For, though guiltineſs be the effect of ſome error, yet uſually it begets a kind of Moderation, ſo far forth, as not to let men caſt ſuch aſperſions upon others, as muſt apparently reflect upon themſelves. Thus cannot the Poet endure that *Gracchus*, who was a factious and unquiet man, ſhould be inveighing againſt *Sedition*: And the Roman Orator rebukes Philoſophers; who, to wax glorious, ſuperſcribed their Names upon thoſe very Books, which they entituled, *Of the contempt of Glory*. What then ſhall we ſay of D. *Potter*, who in the *Title* and *Text* of his whole Book, doth ſo tragically charge *Want of Charity on all ſuch Romaniſts as dare affirm, that Proteſtancy deſtroyeth Salvation*; while he himſelf is in act of pronouncing the like heavy doom againſt Roman Catholiques? For, not ſatisfied with much uncivil language, in affirming the Roman Church *many* (a) *ways to have plaid the Harlot, and in that regard deſerved a bill of divorce from Chriſt, and deteſtation of Chriſtians*; in ſtyling her, that *proud* (b) *and curſt Dame* of Rome, *which takes upon her to revel in the Houſe of God*; in talking of an *Idol* (c) to be worſhipped at *Rome*; he comes at length to thunder out this fearful ſentence againſt her: *For that* (d) Maſs *of Errors* (ſaith he) *in judgement and practice, which is proper to her, and wherein ſhe differs from us, we judge a reconciliation impoſſible, and to us, (who are convicted in conſcience of her corruptions) damnable.* And in another place he ſaith: *For us who* (e) *are convinced in conſcience, that ſhe erres in many things, a neceſſity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe Errors.* By the acerbity of which Cenſure, he doth not only make himſelf guilty of that which he judgeth to be a hainous offence in others, but freeth us alſo from all colour of crime by this his unadviſed recrimination. For, if Roman Catholiques be likewiſe *convicted in conſcience* of the Errors of Proteſtants, they may, and muſt, in conformity to the *Doctor's* own rule, judge a reconciliation with them to be alſo *damnable*. And thus, all the *Want of Charity*, ſo deeply charged on us, diſſolves it ſelf into this poor wonder, *Roman Catholiques believe in their conſcience, that the Religion which they profeſs, is true, and the contrary falſe.*

Quis tulerit Gracchum, &c.

(a) *Pag.* 11.
(b) *Ibid.*
(c) *Pag.* 4. *Edit.* 1.
(d) *Pag.* 20.
(e) *Pag.* 81.

2. Nevertheleſs, we earneſtly deſire, and take care, that our doctrine may not be defamed by miſinterpretation. Far be it from us, by way of inſultation, to apply it againſt Proteſtants, otherwiſe than as they are comprehended under the generality of thoſe who are divided from the only one true Church of Chriſt our Lord, within the Communion whereof he hath confined ſalvation. Neither do we underſtand, why our moſt dear Countrymen ſhould be offended if the Univerſality be particularized under the name of *Proteſtants*, firſt given (f) to certain *Lutherans*, who *proteſting* that they would ſtand out againſt the Imperial decrees, in defence of the Confeſſion exhibited at *Ausburge*, were termed *Proteſtants*, in regard of ſuch their *proteſting*: which *Confeſſio Auguſtana*, diſclaiming from, and being diſclaimed by *Calviniſts* and *Zwinglians*, our naming or exemplifying a general doctrine under the particular name of Proteſtantiſm, ought not in any particular manner to be odious in *England*.

(f) *Sleidan. l.* 6. *fol.* 84.

3. Moreover, our meaning is not, as miſ-informed perſons may conceive, that we give Proteſtants over to reprobation; that we offer no prayers in hope of their ſalvation; that we hold their caſe deſperate. God forbid! We hope, we pray for, their Converſion; and ſometimes we find happy effects of our charitable deſires. Neither is our Cenſure immediatly directed to particular perſons. The Tribunal of particular Judgement is God's alone. When any man, eſteemed a Proteſtant, leaveth to live in this world, we do not inſtantly with precipitation avouch, that he is lodged in Hell. For we are not always acquainted with what ſufficiency of means he was furniſhed for inſtruction; we do not penetrate his capacity to underſtand his Catechiſt; we have no revelation what light might have cleared his error, or Contrition retracted his ſins, in the laſt moment before his death. In ſuch particular caſes, we wiſh more apparent ſigns of ſalvation, but do not give any dogmatical ſentence of perdition. How grievous ſins, *Diſobedience*, *Schiſm*, and *Hereſie* are, is well known. But to diſcern how far the natural malignity of thoſe great offences might be checked by Ignorance, or by ſome ſuch leſſening circumſtance, is the office rather of *Prudence* than of *Faith*.

4. Thus we allow Proteſtants as much Charity, as D. *Potter* ſpares us, for whom in the words above mentioned, and elſewhere, he (g) makes *Ignorance* the beſt hope of ſalvation. Much leſs comfort can we expect from the fierce doctrine of thoſe chief Proteſtants, who teach that for many Ages before *Luther*, Chriſt had no viſible Church upon earth. Not theſe men alone, or ſuch as they, but even the 39. Articles, to which the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Clergy ſubſcribes, cenſure our belief ſo deeply, that Ignorance can ſcarce, or rather not at all, excuſe us from damnation. Our Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, is affirmed to be *repugnant* to the plain words of (h) Scripture; our *Maſſes* to be blaſphemous (i) *Fables*, with much more to be ſeen in the *Articles* themſelves. In a certain Confeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, at the end of their books of Pſalms collected into Meeter, and printed *Cum privilegio Regis*

(g) See *P.* 39.
(h) *Art.* 28.
(i) *Art.* 31.

Regis Regali, they call us *Idolaters*, and *limmes of Antichriſt*; and having ſet down a Catalogue of our doctrins, they conclude, that for them we ſhall after the General Reſurrection be *damned to unqueſtionable fire*.

5. But yet leſt any man ſhould flatter himſelf with our charitable Mitigations, and thereby wax careleſs in ſearch of the true Church, we deſire him to read the *Concluſion* of the *Second Part*, where this matter is more explained.

6. And becauſe we cannot determine what *Judgement* may be eſteemed *raſh*, or *prudent*, except by weighing the reaſons upon which it was grounded, we will here, under one aſpect, preſent a Summary of thoſe Principles, from which we infer, that Proteſtancy in it ſelf unrepented deſtroyes Salvation: intending afterward to prove the truth of every one of the grounds, till, by a concatenation of ſequels, we fall upon the *Concluſion*, for which we are charged with *Want of Charity*.

7. Now, this is our gradation of reaſons: Almighty God, having ordained Mankind to a ſupernatural *End* of eternal felicity, hath in his holy Providence ſetled competent and convenient *Means*, whereby that end may be attained. The univerſal grand Origen of all ſuch means, is the Incarnation and Death of our Bleſſed Saviour, whereby he merited internal grace for us; and founded an *external* viſible Church, provided and ſtored with all thoſe helps which might be neceſſary to Salvation. From hence it followeth, that in this Church, among other advantages, there muſt be ſome effectual means to beget and conſerve Faith, to maintain Unity, to diſcover and condemn Hereſies, to appeaſe and reduce Schiſms, and to determine all Controverſies in Religion. For without ſuch means the Church ſhould not be furniſhed with helps ſufficient to ſalvation, nor God afford ſufficient means to attain that End, to which himſelf ordained Mankind. This means to decide Controverſies in Faith and Religion (whether it ſhould be the holy Scripture, or whatſoever elſe) muſt be indued with an Univerſal Infallibility in whatſoever it propoundeth for a divine Truth, that is, as revealed, ſpoken, or teſtified by Almighty God, whether the matter of its nature be great or ſmall. For if it were ſubject to Error in any one thing, we could not in any other yield it infallible aſſent; becauſe we might with good reaſon doubt, whether it chanced not to err in that particular.

8. Thus far all muſt agree to what we have ſaid, unleſs they have a minde to reduce *Faith* to *Opinion*. And even out of theſe grounds alone, without further proceeding, it undeniably follows, that of two men diſſenting in matters of faith, great or ſmall, few or many, the one cannot be ſaved without repentance, unleſs Ignorance accidentally may in ſome particular perſon plead excuſe. For in that caſe of contrary belief, one muſt of neceſſity be held to oppoſe Gods Word, or Revelation ſufficiently repreſented to his underſtanding by an infallible Propounder; which oppoſition to the Teſtimony of God is undoubtedly a damnable ſin, whether otherwiſe, the thing ſo teſtified, be in it ſelf great or ſmall. And thus we have already made good what was promiſed in the argument of this Chapter, that *amongſt men of different Religions*, one is only capable of being ſaved.

9. Nevertheleſs, to the end that men may know in particular what is the ſaid infallible means upon which we are to relie in all things concerning Faith, and accordingly may be able to judge in what ſafety or danger, more or leſs they live; and becauſe D. *Potter* deſcendeth to divers particulars about Scriptures and the Church, *&c.* we will go forward, and prove, that although Scripture be in it ſelf moſt ſacred, infallible, and divine, yet it alone cannot be *to us a Rule*, or Judge, fit and able to end all doubts and debates emergent in matters of Religion; but that there muſt be ſome external, viſible, publique, living Judge, to whom all ſorts of perſons, both learned and unlearned, may without danger of error have recourſe; and in whoſe judgement they may reſt for the interpreting and propounding of Gods Word or Revelation. And this living Judge we will moſt evidently prove to be no other, but that Holy, Catholique, Apoſtolique, and Viſible Church, which our Saviour purchaſed with the effuſion of his moſt precious bloud.

10. If once therefore it be granted, that the Church is that means which God hath left for deciding all Controverſies in Faith, it manifeſtly will follow, that ſhe muſt be infallible in all her determinations, whether the matters of themſelves be great or ſmall; becauſe, as we ſaid above, it muſt be agreed on all ſides, that if that means which God hath left to determine Controverſies were not infallible in all things propoſed by it, as truths revealed by Almighty God, it could not ſettle in our minds a firm and infallible belief of any one.

11. From this Univerſal Infallibility of God's Church, it followeth, that whoſoever wittingly denyeth any one Point propoſed by her, as revealed by God, is injurious to his divine Majeſty, as if he could either deceive, or be deceived in what he teſtifieth. The averring whereof, were not a *Fundamental* error, but would overthrow the very foundation of all Fundamental Points, and therefore, without repentance, could not poſſibly ſtand with ſalvation.

12. Out of theſe grounds we will ſhew, that although the diſtinction of Points *Fundamental*, and not *Fundamental* be good and uſeful, as it is delivered and applyed by Catholique Divines, to teach what principal Articles of faith, Chriſtians are obliged *explicitely* to believe: yet that it is impertinent to the preſent purpoſe of excuſing any man from grievous ſin, who knowingly *diſbelieves*, that is, believes the contrary of that which God's Church propoſeth as Divine Truth. For it is one thing not to know explicitely ſome thing teſtified by God, and another poſitively to oppoſe what we know he hath teſtified. The former may often be excuſed from ſin, but never the latter, which only is the caſe in Queſtion.

13. In the ſame manner ſhall be demonſtrated, that to alleadge the *Creed*, as containing all Articles of Faith, neceſſary to be explicitely believed, is not pertinent to free from ſin, the voluntary denial of any other Point known to be defined by God's Church. And this were ſufficient to overthrow all that D. *Potter* alleadgeth concerning the *Creed*: though yet, by way of Supererogation, we will prove, that there are divers important matters of Faith which are not mentioned at all in the Creed.

14. From the aforeſaid main Principle, that God hath alwayes had, and alwayes will have on earth, a Church *Viſible*, within whoſe Communion Salvation muſt be hoped; and *infallible*, whoſe definitions

we

we ought to believe; we will prove, that *Luther*, *Calvin*, and all other, who continue the diviſion in Communion, or Faith, from that Viſible Church, which at, and before, *Luther's* appearance was ſpread over the world, cannot be excuſed from *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*, although they oppoſed her Faith but in *one only* Point; whereas it is manifeſt, they diſſent from her in *many* and weighty matters, concerning as well *belief*, as practice.

15. To theſe reaſons drawn from the vertue of *Faith*, we will add one other taken from *Charitas propria*, the Vertue of *Charity*, as it obligeth us, not to expoſe our ſoul to hazard of perdition, when we can put our ſelves in a way much more ſecure, as we will prove that of the Roman Catholiques to be.

16. We are then to prove theſe points: Firſt, that the infallible means to determine controverſies in matters of Faith, is the viſible Church of Chriſt. Secondly, that the diſtinction of Points *Fundamental*, and *not-Fundamental*, maketh nothing to our preſent Queſtion. Thirdly, that, to ſay the *Creed* contains all Fundamental Points of Faith, is neither *pertinent nor true*. Fourthly, that both *Luther*, and all they who, after him, perſiſt in diviſion from the *Communion* and *Faith* of the Roman Church, cannot be excuſed from *Schiſm*. Fifthly, nor from Hereſie. Sixthly and laſtly, that in regard of the precept of *Charity* towards one's ſelf, Proteſtants be in ſtate of ſin, as long as they remain divided from the *Roman* Church. And theſe ſix Points, ſhall be ſeveral Arguments for ſo many enſuing Chapters.

17. Only I will here obſerve, that it ſeemeth very ſtrange that Proteſtants ſhould charge us ſo deeply with *Want of Charity*, for only teaching, that both they and we cannot be ſaved, ſeeing themſelves muſt affirm the like of whoſoever oppoſeth any leaſt Point delivered in Scripture, which they hold to be the ſole Rule of Faith. Out of which ground they muſt be enforced to let all our former Inferences paſs for Good. For, is it not a grievous ſin, to deny any one truth contained in Holy Writ? Is there in ſuch denial, any diſtinction between Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental, ſufficient to excuſe from Hereſie? Is it not impertinent, to alledge the Creed containing all Fundamental Points of Faith, as if, believing it alone, we were at liberty to deny all other Points of Scripture? In a word: According to Proteſtants; Oppoſe not Scripture, there is no Error againſt Faith; Oppoſe it in any leaſt Point, the Error (if Scripture be ſufficiently propoſed, which propoſition is alſo required before a man can be obliged to believe even Fundamental Points) muſt be damnable. What is this, but to ſay with us, *Of Perſons contrary in whatſoever Point of belief, one party only can be ſaved?* And D. *Potter* muſt not take it ill, if Catholiques believe they may be ſaved in that Religion for which they ſuffer. And if by occaſion of this doctrine, men will ſtill be charging us with *Want of Charity*, and be reſolved to *take* ſcandal where none is *given*; we muſt comfort our ſelves with that grave and true ſaying of S. *Gregory*: *If ſcandal (k) be taken from declaring a truth, it is better to permit ſcandal, than forſake the truth.* But the ſolid grounds of our Aſſertion, and the ſincerity of our intention in uttering what we think, yields us confidence, that all will hold for moſt reaſonable the ſaying of Pope *Gelaſius* to *Anaſtaſius* the Emperor: *Far be it from the Roman Emperour that he ſhould hold it for a wrong, to have truth declared to him!* Let us therefore begin with that Point which is the firſt that can be controverted betwixt Proteſtants, and us, for as much as concerns the preſent Queſtion, & is contained in the Argument of the next enſuing Chap.

(k) *S. Greg. Hom. 7. in Ezek.*

The ANSWER to the FIRST CHAPTER.

Shewing, that the Adverſary grants the Former Queſtion and propoſeth a New one: And that there is no reaſon, why among men of different opinions and Communions, one Side only can be ſaved.

AND 1. §. Your firſt onſet is very violent. D. *Potter* is charged with malice and indiſcretion, for *being uncharitable to you, while he is accuſing you of uncharitableneſs.* Verily, a great fault, and folly, if the accuſation be juſt; if unjuſt, a great Calumny. Let us ſee then how you make good your charge. The effect of your diſcourſe, if I miſtake not, is this: D. *Potter chargeth the Roman Church with many and great Errors; judgeth reconciliation between her Doctrine and ours, impoſſible; and that for them who are convicted in Conſcience of her Errors, not to forſake her in them, or to be reconciled unto her, is damnable: Therefore, if Romane Catholiques be convicted in Conſcience of the Errors of Proteſtants, they may and muſt judge a reconciliation with them damnable; and conſequently to judge ſo, is no more uncharitable in them, than it is in the Doctor to judge as he doth.* All this I grant; nor would any Proteſtant accuſe you of *want of Charity*, if you went no further: if you judged the Religion of Proteſtants damnable to them only who profeſs it, being convicted in conſcience that it is erroneous. For, *if*

a man

a man judge ſome act of vertue to be a ſin, in him it is a ſin indeed: So you have taught us, p. 19. So if you be convinced, or rather, to ſpeak properly, perſwaded in conſcience, that our Religion is erroneous, the profeſſion of it, though it ſelf moſt true, to you would be damnable. This therefore I ſubſcribe very willingly, and withall, that if you ſaid no more, D. *Potter* and my ſelf ſhould be not to Papiſts only, but even to Proteſtants, as uncharitable as you are. For I ſhall always profeſs and glory in this uncharitableneſs of judging *hypocriſie a damnable ſin*. Let Hypocrites then and Diſſemblers on both ſides paſs. It is not towards them, but good Chriſtians; not to Proteſtant Profeſſors, but Believers, that we require your Charity. What think you of thoſe that believe ſo verily the truth of our Religion, that they are reſolved to die in it, and, if occaſion were, to die for it? What Charity have you for them? What think ye of thoſe that, in the daies of our Fathers, laid down their lives for it? Are you content that they ſhall be ſaved, or do you hope they may be ſo? Will you grant, that, notwithſtanding their Errors, there is good hope they might die with repentance? and, if they did ſo, certainly they are ſaved? If you will do ſo, this Controverſie is ended. No man will hereafter charge you with *want of Charity*. This is as much as either we give you, or expect of you, while you remain in your Religion. But then you muſt leave abuſing ſilly people, with telling them (as your faſhion is) that *Proteſtants confeſs, Papiſts may be ſaved, but Papiſts confeſs not ſo much of Proteſtants; therefore yours is the ſafer way, and in Wiſdom and Charity to our own ſouls we are bound to follow it*. For, granting this, you grant as much hope of ſalvation to Proteſtants, as Proteſtants do to you. If you will not, but will ſtill affirm, as *Charity Miſtaken* doth, that *Proteſtants*, not diſſemblers, but believers, *without a particular repentance of their Religion cannot be ſaved*: This, I ſay, is a *want of Charity*, into the ſociety whereof D. *Potter* cannot be drawn but with palpable and tranſparent *Sophiſtry*. For, I pray Sir, what dependance is there between theſe Propoſitions: We that hold Proteſtant Religion falſe ſhould be damned if we ſhould profeſs it, Therefore they alſo ſhall be damned, that hold it true? Juſt as if you ſhould conclude, *Becauſe he that doubts is damned if he eat*, Therefore he that doth not doubt, is damned alſo if he eat. And therefore though your Religion to us, and ours to you, if profeſſed againſt Conſcience, would be damnable; yet may it well be uncharitable to define it ſhall be ſo, to them that profeſs either this or that according to Conſcience. This recrimination therefore upon D. *Potter* wherewith you begin, is a plain Fallacy: And, I fear, your proceedings will be anſwerable to theſe beginnings!

2. *Ad* §. 2. In this Paragraph, Proteſtants are thus far comforted, that they are not ſent to Hell without Company; which, the Poet tels us, is the miſerable *comfort of miſerable Men*. Then we in *England* are requeſted *not to be offended with the name of Proteſtants*. Which is a favour I ſhall eaſily grant, if by it be underſtood thoſe that *Proteſt*, not againſt *Imperial Edicts*, but againſt the *Corruptions of the Church of* Rome.

3. *Ad* §. 3, 4, 5, 6. *That you give us not over to reprobation, That you pray and hope for our ſalvation*, if it be a Charity, it's ſuch an one as is common to *Turks*, and *Jews*, and *Pagans* with us. But that which follows, is extraordinary; neither do I know any man that requires more

of

of you than there you pretend to. For there you tell us, *That when any man, eſteemed a Proteſtant, dies, you do not inſtantly avouch that he is lodged in Hell.* Where the word, *eſteemed*, is ambiguous: For it may ſignifie, *eſteemed truly*, or *eſteemed falſly*. He may be eſteemed a Proteſtant that *is ſo*: And he may be eſteemed a Proteſtant that is not *ſo*. And therefore I ſhould have had juſt occaſion to have laid to your charge the tranſgreſſion of your own chief preſcription, which you ſay, *truth exacts at our hands*, that is, *to ſpeak clearly or diſtinctly, and not to walk in darkneſs*; but that your following words, to my underſtanding, declare ſufficiently, that you ſpeak of *both ſorts*. For there you tell us, that the Reaſons, why you damn not any man that dies with the eſteem of a Proteſtant, are, 1. *Becauſe you are not alwayes acquainted with what ſufficiency of means he was furniſhed for inſtruction*; You muſt mean touching the falſhood of his own Religion, and the truth of yours. Which reaſon is proper to thoſe that are Proteſtants in *truth*, and not only in *eſtimation*. 2. Becauſe you do *not penetrate his capacity to underſtand his Catechiſt*; which is alſo peculiar to thoſe, who for want of capacity (as you conceive) remain Proteſtants indeed, and are not only ſo accounted. 3. Becauſe you have *no Revelation what light might clear his errors*; which belongs to thoſe which were eſteemed Proteſtants, but indeed were not ſo. 4. Becauſe you have *no Revelation what Contrition might have retracted his ſins*: which reaſon being diſtinct from the former, and divided from it by the disjunctive Particle, *Or*, inſinuates unto us, that though no light did clear the errors of a dying Proteſtant; yet *Contrition* might, for ought you know, retract his ſins: which appropriates this reaſon alſo to Proteſtants truly ſo eſteemed. I wiſh with all my heart that in obedience to your own Preſcription, you had expreſſed your ſelf in this matter more fully and plainly. Yet that which you ſay, doth plainly enough afford us theſe Corollaries.

1 That whatſoever Proteſtant wanteth capacity, or, having it, wanteth ſufficient means of inſtruction to convince his Conſcience of the falſhood of his own, and the truth of the *Roman* Religion, by the confeſſion of his moſt rigid Adverſaries, may be ſaved, notwithſtanding any error in his Religion.

2 That nothing hinders, but that a Proteſtant, dying a Proteſtant, may die with Contrition for all his ſins.

3 That if he do die with Contrition, he may and ſhall be ſaved.

4. All theſe acknowledgements we have from you, while you are, as you ſay, ſtating, but, as I conceive, granting the very Point in queſtion; which was, as I have already proved out of *C. M. Whether, without uncharitableneſs, you may pronounce, that Proteſtants dying in the belief of their Religion, and without particular repentance and derelict ion of it, cannot poſſibly be ſaved.* Which *C. M.* affirms univerſally, and without any of your limitations. But this preſumption of his, you thus qualifie, by ſaying, that *This ſentence cannot be pronounced truly, and therefore ſure not charitably; Neither of thoſe Proteſtants that want means ſufficient to inſtruct and convince them of the truth of your Religion, and the falſhood of their own; Nor of thoſe, who though they have negected the means they might have had, dyed with Contrittion, that is, with a ſorow for all their ſins, proceeding from the love of God.* So that, according to your Doctrin, it ſhall remain upon *ſuch only as either were, or, but for their own fault, might have been, ſufficiently convinced*

of the truth of your Religion, and the falſhood of their own, and yet dye in it without Contrition. Which Doctrine if you would ſtand to; and not pull down, and pull back with one hand, what you give and build with the other, this Controverſie were ended; and I ſhould willingly acknowledge that which follows in your fourth Paragraph, *That you allow Proteſtants as much Charity as D.* Potter *allows you.* But then I muſt intreat you to alter the *argument of this Chapter,* and not to go about to give us reaſons, *why, amongſt men of different Religions, one ſide only can be ſaved abſolutely,* which your Reaſons drive at: But you muſt temper the crudeneſs of your Aſſertion, by ſaying, *One ſide only can be ſaved, unleſs want of Conviction, or elſe Repentance, excuſe the other.* Beſides, you muſt not only abſtain from damning any Proteſtant in particular, but, from affirming in general, that *Proteſtants dying in their Religion cannot be ſaved*; for you muſt always remember to add this Caution, unleſs *they were excuſably Ignorant of the falſhood of it, or died with Contrition.* And then, conſidering that you cannot know, whether or no, all things conſidered, they were convinced ſufficiently of the truth of your Religion, and the falſhood of their own, you are obliged by Charity to judge the beſt, and hope they are not. Conſidering again, that, notwithſtanding their Errors, they may die with Contrition, and that it is no way improbable that they do ſo, and the contrary you cannot be certain of, You are bound in Charity to judge and hope they do ſo. Conſidering thirdly and laſtly, that if they die not with *Contrition,* yet it is very probable they may die with *Attrition,* and that this pretence of yours, that *Contrition will ſerve without actual Confeſſion, but Attrition will not,* is but a nicety or fancy, or rather, to give it the true name, a Device of your own, to ſerve ends and purpoſes; God having no where declared himſelf, but that whereſoever he will accept of that Repentance, which you are pleaſed to call *Contrition,* he will accept of that which you call *Attrition*; For, though he like beſt the bright flaming holocauſt of Love, yet he rejects not, he quencheth not, the ſmoaking flax of that Repentance (if it be true and effectual) which proceeds from hope and fear: Theſe things, I ſay, conſidered (unleſs you will have the Charity of your Doctrine riſe up in judgement againſt your uncharitable Practice) you muſt not only not be peremptorie, in damning Proteſtants, but you muſt hope well of their Salvation: and, out of this hope, you muſt do for them as well as others, thoſe, as you conceive, Charitable Offices, of Praying, giving Alms, and offering Sacrifice, which uſually you do, for thoſe of whoſe Salvation you are well and charitably perſwaded; (for, I believe, you will never conceive ſo well of Proteſtants, as to aſſure your ſelves they go directly to heaven.) Theſe things when you do, I ſhall believe you think as charitably as you ſpeak. But until then, as he ſaid in the Comedie, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* ſo may I ſay to you, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta non videam?* To what purpoſe ſhould you give us charitable words, which preſently you retract again, by denying us your charitable actions? And, as theſe things you muſt do, if you will ſtand to and make good this pretended Charity, ſo muſt I tell you again and again, that one thing you muſt not do; I mean, You muſt not affright poor people out of their Religion, with telling them, that, *by the confeſſion of both ſides, your way is ſafe, but, in your judgement, ours un-*

undoubtedly damnable. Seeing neither you deny Salvation to *Proteſtants dying with repentance*, nor we promiſe it to you, *if ye die without it.* For, to deal plainly with you, I know no Proteſtant that hath any other hope of your Salvation, but upon theſe grounds, that *unaffected ignorance* may excuſe you, or *true repentance* obtain pardon for you; neither do the heavy cenſures, which Proteſtants (you ſay) paſs upon your errors, any way hinder, but they may hope as well of you, upon Repentance, as I do. For the *fierce Doctrine*, which, God knows who, teacheth, that *Chriſt for many Ages before* Luther *had no viſible Church upon earth*; will be mild enough, if you conceive them to mean (as perhaps they do) by *no viſible Church, none pure and free from corruptions*, which in your judgement is all one with no Church. But the truth is, the *corruption* of the Church, and the *deſtruction* of it, is not all one. For, if a particular Man or Church may (as you confeſs they may) hold ſome particular Errors, and yet be a Member of the Church Univerſal; why may not the Church hold ſome Univerſal Error, and yet be ſtill the Church? eſpecially ſeeing, you ſay, it is nothing but *oppoſing the Doctrine of the Church that makes an Error damnable*, and it is impoſſible, that the Church ſhould oppoſe the Church, I mean, that the preſent Church ſhould oppoſe it ſelf. And then for the Engliſh Proteſtants, though they cenſure your Errors deeply, yet, by your favour, with their deepeſt cenſures it may well conſiſt, that *invincible ignorance* may excuſe you from damnation for them. For you your ſelf confeſs, *That Ignorance may excuſe Errors, even in Fundamental Articles of Faith: ſo that a man ſo erring ſhall not offend at all in ſuch his ignorance or error:* they are your own words, *Pref.* §. 22. And again, with their heavieſt cenſures it may well conſiſt, that your Errors, though in themſelves damnable, yet may prove *not-damning to you*, if you die with true repentance, for all your ſins known and unknown.

5. Thus much Charity therefore, if you ſtand to what you have ſaid, is interchangeably granted by each Side to the other, that Neither Religion is ſo fatally *deſtructive, but that by Ignorance or Repentance Salvation may be had on both Sides:* though with a difference that keeps Papiſts ſtill on the more uncharitable ſide. For whereas we conceive a lower degree of Repentance (that which they call *Attrition*) if it be true, and effectual, and convert the heart of the penitent, will ſerve in them: They pretend (even *this Author* which is moſt charitable towards us) that *without Contrition* there is no hope for us. But, though Proteſtants may not obtain this purchaſe at ſo eaſie a rate as Papiſts; yet (even Papiſts being Judges) they may obtain it: and, though there is no entrance for them but at the only door of *Contrition*, yet they may enter; Heaven is not inacceſſible to them. Their errors are no ſuch impenetrable Iſthmus's between them and Salvation, but that *Contrition* may make a way through them. All their Schiſm and Hereſie is no ſuch fatal poiſon, but that, if a man joyn with it the Antidote of a general Repentance, he may die in it, and live for ever. Thus much then being acknowledged, I appeal to any indifferent Reader, whether C. M. be not by his *Hyperaſpiſt* forſaken in the plain field, and the Point in queſtion granted to D. *Potter*, viz. *That Proteſtancy, even without a particular Repentance, is not deſtructive of Salvation.* So that all the Controverſie remaining now, is, not ſimply *Whether Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* as it was at firſt propoſed, but, *Whether Proteſtancy*

in it self (that is, *abstracted from Ignorance and Contrition*) *destroys Salvation?* So that, as a foolish fellow, who gave a Knight the Lye, desiring withall leave of him to set his Knighthood aside, was answered by him, that he would not suffer any thing to be set aside that belonged unto him: So might we justly take it amiss, that, conceiving as you do, Ignorance and Repentance such necessary things for us, you are not more willing to consider us with them, than without them. For my part, such is my Charity to you, that considering what great necessity *You* have, as much as any *Christian Society in the World*, that these Sanctuaries of *Ignorance* and *Repentance* should always stand open, I can very hardly perswade my self so much as in my most secret consideration to devest you of these so needful qualifications: But whensoever your errors, superstitions, and impieties come into my mind, (and, besides the general bonds of Humanity and Christianity, my own particular Obligations to many of you, such and so great, that you cannot perish without a part of my Self,) my only comfort is, amidst these Agonies, that the Doctrine and Practice too of Repentance, is yet remaining in your Church: And that, though you put on a face of confidence of your innocence in point of Doctrine, yet you will be glad to stand in the eye of Mercy as well as your fellows, and not be so stout, as to refuse either God's pardon or the King's.

6. But for the present, Protestancy is called to the bar, and though not sentenced by you to death without Mercy, yet arraigned of so much natural malignity, (if not corrected by *ignorance* or *contrition*) as to be *in it self destructive of Salvation*. Which Controversie I am content to dispute with you, tying my self to follow the Rules prescribed by you in your *Preface*. Only I am to remember you, that the adding of this limitation (*in it self*) hath made this a new Question; and that this is not the Conclusion, for which you were charged with *want of Charity*. But that, whereas, according to the grounds of your own Religion, *Protestants may die in their supposed errors, either with excusable ignorance, or with Contrition, and if they do so, may be saved*, you still are peremptory in pronouncing them damned. Which Position, supposing your Doctrine true, and ours false, as it is far from *Charity*, (whose essential Character it is, *to judge and hope the best*), so I believe that I shall clearly evince this new, but more moderate, Assertion of yours to be far from verity, and that it is *Popery, and not Protestancy, which in it self destroys Salvation*.

7. *Ad §. 7. & 8.* In your gradation I shall rise so far with you as to grant, *That Christ founded a visible Church, stored with all helps necessary to Salvation, particularly with sufficient means to beget and conserve Faith, to maintain Unity, and compose Schisms, to discover and condemn Heresies, and to determine all Controversies in Religion*, which were necessary to be determined. For all these purposes, he gave at the beginning (as we may see in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*) *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Doctors*: who by word of mouth taught their Contemporaries, and by writings (wrot indeed by some, but approved by all of them) taught their Christian posterity to the world's end, how all these ends, and that which is the End of all these ends, Salvation, is to be atchieved. And these means the Providence of God hath still preserved, and so preserved, that they are sufficient for all these intents. I say, *sufficient*, though, through the

the malice of men, not always *effectual*; for, that the ſame means may be Sufficient for the compaſſing an end, and not Effectual, you muſt not deny; who hold, that *God gives to all men ſufficient means of Salvation, and yet that all are not ſaved.* I ſaid alſo, Sufficient to determine all Controverſies, which were *neceſſary to be determined.* For, if ſome Controverſies may for many Ages be undetermined, and yet in the mean-while men be ſaved; why ſhould, or how can the Churche's being furniſht with effectual means to determine *all Controverſies in Religion*, be neceſſary to Salvation; the end it ſelf, to which theſe means are ordained, being, as experience ſhews, not neceſſary? Plain ſenſe will teach every man, that the neceſſity of the means muſt always be meaſured by, and can never exceed, the neceſſity of the end. As, if eating be neceſſary, only that I may live; then certainly if I have no neceſſity to live, I have no neceſſity to eat. If I have no need to be at *London*, I have no need of a horſe to carry me thither. If I have no need to fly, I have no need of wings. Anſwer me then I pray directly, and categorically, Is it neceſſary that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be determined? or, is it not? If it be, Why is the the Queſtion of *Predetermination*, of the *immaculate Conception*, of the *Pope's indirect power in Temporalties*, ſo long undetermined? If not, What is it but hypocriſie to pretend ſuch great neceſſity of ſuch effectual means, for the atchieving that end, which is it ſelf not neceſſary? Chriſtians therefore have and ſhall have *means ſufficient* (though not always effectual) *to determine*, not all *Controverſies*, but all *neceſſary to be determined.* I proceed on farther with you, and grant that this means to decide Controverſies in Faith and Religion, muſt be endued with an Univerſal Infallibility in whatſoever it propoundeth for a divine Truth. For, if it may be falſe in any one thing of this nature, in any thing which God requires men to believe, we can yield unto it but a wavering and fearful aſſent in any thing. Theſe Grounds therefore I grant very readily, and give you free leave to make your beſt advantage of them. And yet, to deal truly, I do not perceive how from the denial of any of them it would follow that Faith is Opinion: or, from the granting them, that it is not ſo. But for for my part whatſoever clamour you have raiſed againſt me, I think no otherwiſe of the Nature of Faith, I mean, *Hiſtorical Faith*, than generally both Proteſtants and Papiſts do; for, I conceive it *an aſſent to divine Revelations upon the Authority of the Revealer.* Which though in many things it differ from Opinion, (as commonly the word *opinion* is underſtood) yet in ſome things, I doubt not but you will confeſs, that it agrees with it. As firſt, that as Opinion is an Aſſent, ſo is Faith alſo. Secondly, that as Opinion, ſo Faith, is always built upon leſs evidence than that of Senſe or Science. Which Aſſertion you not only grant, but mainly contend for in your *ſixth Chapter.* Thirdly and laſtly, that, as Opinion, ſo Faith admit degrees; and that, as there may be a ſtrong and weak Opinion, ſo there may be a ſtrong and weak Faith. Theſe things if you will grant (as ſure if you be in your right mind you will not deny any of them) I am well contented that this ill-ſounding word, *Opinion*, ſhould be diſcarded, and that among the Intellectual habits you ſhould ſeek out ſome other *Genus* for *Faith*. For I will never contend with any man about words, who grants my meaning.

8. *But though the eſſence of Faith exclude not all weakneſs and imperfection,*

yet may it be enquired, Whether any certainty of Faith, under the highest degree, may be sufficient to please God and attain Salvation? Whereunto I answer, That though Men are unreasonable, God requires not any thing but Reason. They will not be pleased without a down-weight, but God is contented if the scale be turned. They pretend, that heavenly things cannot be seen to any purpose, but by the mid-day light: But God will be satisfied, if we receive any degree of light which makes us leave the *works of darkness, and walk as children of the light.* They exact a certainty of Faith above that of sense or science; God desires only that we believe the Conclusion, as much as the Premisses deserve; that the strength of our Faith be equal or proportionable to the credibility of the Motives to it. Now though I have, and ought to have, an absolute certainty of this Thesis, *All which God reveals for truth, is true*, being a Proposition, that may be demonstrated, or rather so evident to any one that understands it, that it needs it not; Yet of this Hypothesis, *That all the Articles of our Faith were revealed by God*, we cannot ordinarily have any rational and acquired certainty, more than moral, founded upon these Considerations: First, that the goodness of the precepts of Christianity, and the greatness of the promises of it, shews it, of all other Religions, most likely to come from the Fountain of goodness. And then that a constant, famous, and very general Tradition, so credible that no wise man doubts of any other which hath but the fortieth part of the credibility of this; such and so credible a Tradition, tells us, that God himself hath set his Hand and Seal to the truth of this Doctrine, by doing great, and glorious, and frequent Miracles in confirmation of it. Now our Faith is an assent to this Conclusion, that *the doctrine of Christianity is true*, which being deduced from the former *Thesis*, which is Metaphysically certain, and from the former *Hypothesis*, whereof we can have but a Moral certainty, we cannot possibly by natural means be more certain of it than of the weaker of the Premisses; as a River will not rise higher than the fountain from which it flows. For the Conclusion always follows the worser part, if there be any worse: and must be Negative, particular, Contingent, or but Morally certain, if any of the Propositions, from whence it is derived, be so: Neither can we be certain of it in the highest degree, unless we be thus certain of all the Principles whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot go or stand strongly, if either of his legs be weak. Or as a building cannot be stable, if any one of the necessary pillars thereof be infirm and instable. Or as, If a message be brought me, from a man of absolute credit with me, but by a messenger that is not so, my confidence of the Truth of the Relation, cannot but be rebated and lessened, by my diffidence in the Relatour.

9. Yet all this I say not, as if I doubted, that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble prayer, and sincere obedience, may, and will by degrees, advance his servants higher, and give them a certainty of adherence, beyond their certainty of evidence. But, what God gives as a reward to believers, is one thing; and what he requires of all men, as their duty, is another; and what he will accept of, out of grace and favour, is yet another. To those that believe, and live according to their faith, he gives by degrees the *spirit of obsignation and confirmation*, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: And to be as fully and resolutely assured of the Gospel of Christ, as those which

which heard it from Chriſt himſelf with their ears, which ſaw it with their eyes, which looked upon it, and whoſe hands handled the Word of Life. He requires of all, that their Faith ſhould be (as I have ſaid) proportionable to the Motives and Reaſons enforcing to it; he will accept of the weakeſt and loweſt degree of Faith, if it be living and effectual unto true Obedience. For he it is that *will not quench the ſmoaking flax, nor break the bruiſed Reed.* He did not reject the prayer of that diſtreſſed man that cryed unto him, *Lord, I believe; Lord, help mine unbelief.* He commands us to *receive them that are weak in faith*, and thereby declares that he receives them. And as nothing avails with him, but Faith *which worketh by love:* So any Faith, if it be but as a *grain of muſtard-ſeed*, if it *work by love*, ſhall certainly avail with him, and be accepted of him. Some experience makes me fear, that the faith of conſidering and diſcourſing men, is like to be crackt with too much ſtraining: And that being poſſeſſed with this *falſe* Principle, that it is in vain to believe the Goſpel of Chriſt, with ſuch a kind or degree of aſſent, as they yield to other matters of Tradition: And finding that their faith of it, is to them undiſcernable, from the belief they give to the truth of other Stories; are in danger either not to believe at all, thinking, not at all as good as to no purpoſe; or elſe, though indeed they do believe it, yet to think they do not, and to caſt themſelves into wretched agonies and perplexities, as fearing they have not that, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, and obtain eternal happineſs. Conſideration of this advantage, which the Devil probably may make of this Fancy, made me willing to inſiſt ſomewhat largely upon the Refutation of it.

10. I return now thither from whence I have digreſſed, and aſſure you, concerning the grounds afore-laid, which were, that there is a *Rule of Faith whereby Controverſies may be decided, which are neceſſary to be decided*; and that *this Rule is univerſally infallible*, That notwithſtanding any opinion I hold, touching Faith or any thing elſe, I may, and do believe them, as firmly as you pretend to do. And therefore you may build on, in God's name; for by God's help, I ſhall always embrace, whatſoever ſtructure is naturally and rationally laid upon them, whatſoever concluſion, may to my underſtanding be evidently deduced from them. You ſay, out of them it undeniably follows, *That, of two diſagreeing in matter of Faith, the one cannot be ſaved, but by repentance or ignorance.* I anſwer, by diſtinction of thoſe terms, *two diſſenting in a matter of faith.* For it may be either in a thing which is indeed a *matter of Faith*, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe; that is, ſomething, the Belief whereof God requires under pain of damnation: And ſo the Concluſion is true, though the Conſequence of it from your former premiſſes either is none at all, or ſo obſcure, that I can hardly diſcern it. Or it may be, as it often falls out concerning a thing which being indeed *no matter of Faith, is yet overvalued* by the parties at variance, and eſteemed to be ſo. And in this ſenſe it is neither conſequent, nor true. The untruth of it I have already declared in my examination of your Preface. The inconſequence of it, is of itſelf evident; for, Who ever heard of a wilder Collection than this —

God hath provided means ſufficient to decide all Controverſies in Religion, neceſſary to be decided;

This means is univerſally infallible;

Therefore

Therefore of two, that differ in any thing which they eſteem a matter of Faith, one cannot be ſaved.

He that can find any connection between theſe Propoſitions, I believe will be able to find good coherence between the deaf Plaintiff's Accuſation, in the Greek Epigram, and the deaf Defendant's Anſwer, and the deaf Judge's Sentence: And to contrive them all into a formal Categorical Syllogiſm.

11. Indeed, if the matter in agitation were plainly decided, by this infallible means of deciding Controverſies, and the Parties in variance knew it to be ſo, and yet would ſtand out in their diſſention; this were, in one of them, direct oppoſition to the Teſtimony of God, and undoubtedly a damnable ſin. But, if you take the liberty to ſuppoſe what you pleaſe, you may very eaſily conclude what you liſt. For, who is ſo fooliſh as to grant you theſe unreaſonable Poſtulates, that every emergent Controverſie of Faith is plainly decided by the means of deciſion which God hath appointed; and that, of the parties litigant, one is always ſuch a convicted Recuſant as you pretend? Certainly, if you ſay ſo, having no better warrant than you have, or can have for it, this is more proper and formal uncharitableneſs, than ever was charged upon you. Me-thinks, with much more Reaſon, and much more Charity, you might ſuppoſe, that many of theſe Controverſies, which are now diſputed among Chriſtians (all which profeſs themſelves lovers of Chriſt, and truly deſirous to know his will and do it) are either *not decidable* by that means which God hath provided, and ſo not neceſſary to be decided: or, if they be, yet *not ſo plainly and evidently*, as to oblige all men to hold one way: or Laſtly, if decidable, and evidently decided, yet you may hope that the erring party, by reaſon of ſome veil before his eyes, *ſome excuſable ignorance or unavoidable prejudice*, doth not ſee the Queſtion to be decided againſt him, and ſo oppoſeth not that which He doth know to be the Word of God, but only that which You know to be ſo, and which he might know, were he void of prejudice. Which is a fault I confeſs, but a fault, which is incident even to good and honeſt men very often: and not of ſuch a gigantique diſpoſition, as you make it, to fly directly upon God Almighty, and to give him the Lye to his face.

12. *Ad §.* 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. In all this long Diſcourſe you only tell us what you will do, but do nothing. Many Poſitions there are, but proofs of them you offer none, but reſerve them to the Chapters following; and there, in their proper places, they ſhall be examined. The ſumm of all your Aſſumpts collected by your ſelf, §. 16. is this, That *the infallible means of determining Controverſies, is the Viſible Church.*

That, *the diſtinction of Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental, maketh nothing to the preſent Queſtion.*

That, *to ſay, the Creed containeth all Fundamentals, is neither pertinent nor true.*

That, *whoſoever perſiſt in Diviſion from the Communion and Faith of the Roman Church, are guilty of Schiſm and Hereſie.*

That, *in regard of the Precept of Charity towards one's ſelf, Proteſtants are in ſtate of ſin, while they remain divided from the Roman Church.*

To all theſe Aſſertions I will content my ſelf for the preſent to oppoſe this one, *That not one of them all is true.* Only I may not omit to tell you, that

that if the firſt of them were as true as the Pope himſelf deſires it ſhould be, yet the Corollary, which you deduce from it, would be utterly inconſequent, That, *Whoſoever denies any Point propoſed by the Church, is injurious to God's Divine Majeſty; as if He could deceive, or be deceived.* For though your Church were indeed as *Infallible a Propounder of Divine Truths* as it pretends to be, yet, if it appeared not to me to be ſo, I might very well believe God moſt true, and your Church moſt falſe. As, though the Goſpel of S. *Matthew* be the Word of God; yet, if I neither knew it to be ſo, nor believed it, I might believe in God, and yet think that Goſpel a Fable. Hereafter therefore I muſt entreat you to remember, that our being guilty of this impiety, depends not only upon your being, but upon our knowing that you are ſo. Neither muſt you argue thus; *The Church of* Rome *is the Infallible Propounder of Divine Verities, therefore he that oppoſeth Her, calls God's Truth in Queſtion:* But thus rather, *The Church of* Rome *is ſo, and Proteſtants know it to be ſo; therefore in oppoſing her, they impute to God, that either he deceives them, or is deceived himſelf.* For as I may deny ſomething which you upon your knowledge have affirmed, and yet never diſparage your honeſty, if I never knew that you affirmed it: So I may be undoubtedly certain of God's Omniſcience, and Veracity, and yet doubt of ſomething which he hath revealed; provided, I do not know, nor believe that he hath revealed it. So, that though your Church be the appointed witneſs of God's Revelations, yet until you know, that we know ſhe is ſo, you cannot without foul calumny impute to us, That *we charge God blaſphemouſly with deceiving, or being deceived.* You will ſay perhaps, That this is directly conſequent from our Doctrine, *That the Church may err*, which is directed by God in all her Propoſals. True, if we knew it to be directed by him, otherwiſe not; much leſs if we believe, and know the contrary. But then, if it were conſequent from our Opinion, have you ſo little Charity, as to ſay, that men are *juſtly chargeable with all the conſequences of their Opinions*; Such Conſequences, I mean, as they do not own, but diſclaim; and, if there were a neceſſity of doing either, would much rather forſake their Opinion, than imbrace thoſe Conſequences? What opinion is there that draws after it ſuch a train of *portentous blaſphemies*, as that of the *Dominicans*, by the judgement of the beſt Writers of your own *Order*? And will you ſay now, that the *Dominicans* are juſtly chargeable with all thoſe Blaſphemies? If not, ſeeing our caſe (take it at the worſt) is but the ſame, why ſhould not your judgment of us be the ſame? I appeal to all thoſe Proteſtants that have gone over to your Side; whether when they were moſt averſe from it, they did ever deny or doubt of *God's Omniſcience or Veracity*; whether they did ever believe, or were taught, that *God did deceive them, or was deceived himſelf.* Nay, I provoke to you your ſelf, and deſire you to deal truly, and to tell Us whether you do in your heart believe, that we do indeed not believe the eternal Veracity of the eternal Verity? And, if you judge ſo ſtrangely of us, having no better ground for it, than you have or can have, we ſhall not need any farther proof of your uncharitableneſs towards us, this being the extremity of true uncharitableneſs. If not, then, I hope, having no other ground but this (which ſure is none at all) to pronounce us *damnable Heretiques*, you will ceaſe to do ſo; and hereafter (as, if your ground be true, you may do with more Truth and Charity) collect thus,

They

They only err damnably, who oppose what they know God hath testified; But, *Protestants sure do not oppose what they know God hath testified, at least we cannot with Charity say they do*; *Therefore they either do not err damnably, or with Charity we cannot say they do so.*

13. *Ad Q.* 17. *Protestants* (you say) *according to their own grounds must hold, that of persons contrary in whatsoever Point of Belief one part only can be saved, therefore it is strangely done of them to charge Papists with want of Charity for holding the same.* The Consequence I acknowledge, but wonder much what it should be that lays upon Protestants any necessity to do so! You tell us, it is their holding *Scripture the sole Rule of Faith*: For this, you say, obligeth them to pronounce them damned, that oppose any least Point *delivered in Scripture*. This I grant, If they oppose it after sufficient declaration, so that either they *know it to be contained in Scripture*, or have no just probable Reason, and which may move an honest man to doubt, Whether or no it be there contained. For to oppose in the first case, in a man that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, is, to give God the lye. To oppose in the second, is, to be obstinate against Reason; and therefore a sin, though not so great as the former. But then this is nothing to the purpose of the necessity of damning all those that are of contrary belief; and that for these Reasons. First, because the contrary belief may be touching a Point not at all mentioned in Scripture; and such Points, though indeed they be not *matters of Faith*, yet by men in variance are often over-valued and esteemed to be so. So that, though it were damnable to oppose any Point contained in Scripture, yet Persons of a contrary belief (as *Victor*, and *Polycrates*, S. *Cyprian*, and *Stephen*) might both be saved, because their contrary belief was not touching any Point contained in Scripture. Secondly, because the contrary belief may be about the sense of some place of Scripture which is ambiguous, and with probability capable of divers senses; and in such cases it is no marvel, and sure no sin, if several men go several ways. Thirdly, because the contrary belief may be concerning Points wherein Scripture may, with so great probability, be alledged on both sides, (which is a sure note of a Point *not necessary*) that men of honest and upright hearts, true lovers of God and of Truth, such as desire above all things, to know God's will and to do it, may, without any fault at all, some go one way, and some another, and some (and those as good men as either of the former) suspend their judgments, and expect some *Elias to solve doubts*, and reconcile repugnancies. Now in all such Questions, one side or other (which soever it is) holds that which indeed is opposite to the sense of the Scripture, which God intended; for it is impossible that God should intend Contradictions. But then this intended sense is not so fully declared, but that they which oppose it, may verily believe that they indeed maintain it, and have great shew of reason to induce them to believe so; and therefore are not to be damned, as men opposing that which they either know to be a Truth delivered in Scripture, or have no probable Reason to believe the contrary; but rather, in Charity to be acquitted and absolved, as men who endeavour to find the Truth, but fail of it through humane frailty.

This ground being laid, the Answer to your ensuing Interrogatories, which you conceive impossible, is very obvious and easie.

14. *To the first, Whether it be not in any man a grievous sin to deny any one*

one Truth contained in holy Writ? I anſwer, Yes, if he knew it to be ſo, or have no probable Reaſon to doubt of it: otherwiſe, not.

15. *To the ſecond: Whether there be in ſuch denial any diſtinction between Fundamental and not-Fundamental ſufficient to excuſe from Hereſie?* I anſwer, Yes, There is ſuch a Diſtinction. But the Reaſon is, becauſe thoſe Points, either in themſelves, or by accident, are *Fundamental*, which are *evidently contained in Scripture, to him that knows them to be ſo*: Thoſe not-Fundamental, which are there-hence deducible, but probably only, not evidently.

16. *To the third: Whether it be not impertinent to alledge the Creed as containing all Fundamental Points of Faith, as if believing it alone we were at Liberty to deny all other Points of Scripture?* I anſwer, It was never alledged to any ſuch purpoſe; but only as a ſufficient, or rather more than a ſufficient Summarie of thoſe Points of Faith, which were of neceſſity to be believed actually and explicitly; and that only of ſuch which were meerly and purely *Credenda*, and not *Agenda*.

17. *To the fourth*, drawn as a Corollary from the former, *Whether this be not to ſay, that, Of Perſons contrary in belief, one part only can be ſaved?* I anſwer, By no means. For they may differ about Points *not contained in Scripture*: They may differ about the *ſenſe of ſome ambiguous Texts* of Scripture: They may differ about ſome Doctrines, for, and againſt which Scriptures may be alledged with *ſo great probability*, as may juſtly excuſe either Part from Hereſie, and a ſelf-condemning Obſtinacy. And therefore, though D. *Potter* do not take it ill, that you believe your ſelves may be ſaved in your Religion; yet, notwithſtanding all that hath yet been pretended to the contrarie, he may juſtly condemn you, and that out of your own principles, of *uncharitable preſumption*, for affirming as you do, that *no man can be ſaved out of it*.

CHAP. II.

What is that means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our Underſtanding, and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.

OF our eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to holy Scripture, even Proteſtants themſelves do in fact give teſtimony, while they poſſeſs it from us, and take it upon the integrity of our cuſtody. No cauſe imaginable could avert our will from giving the function of ſupreme and ſole Judge to holy Writ, if both the thing were not impoſſible in it ſelf, and if both reaſon and experience did not convince our underſtanding, that, by this Aſſertion Contentions are increaſed, and not ended. We acknowledge holy Scripture to be a moſt perfect Rule, for as much as a Writing can be a Rule: We only deny that it excludes, either divine Tradition, though it be unwritten, or an external Judge to keep, to propoſe, to interpret in a true, Orthodox, and Catholique ſenſe. Every ſingle Book, every Chapter, yea, every period of holy Scripture is infallibly true, and wants no due perfection. But muſt we therefore inferr, that all other Books of Scripture are to be excluded, leſt, by addition of them, we may ſeem to derogate from the perfection of the former? When the firſt Books of the Old and New Teſtament were written, they did not exclude unwritten Traditions, nor the Authority of the Church to decide Controverſies; and who hath then ſo altered their nature, and filled them with ſuch jealouſies, as that now they cannot agree for fear of mutual diſparagement? What greater wrong is it for the written Word, to be compartner now with the unwritten, than for the unwritten, which was once alone, to be afterward joyned with the written? Who ever heard, that, to commend the fidelity of a Keeper, were to diſauthorize the thing committed to his cuſtody? Or that, to extol the integrity and knowledge, and to avouch the neceſſity of a Judge in ſuits of Law, were to deny perfection in the Law? Are there not in Commonwealths, beſides the Laws, written and unwritten cuſtoms, Judges appointed to declare both the one, and the other, as ſeveral occaſions may require?

2. That the Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies of Faith, we gather it very clearly, From the quality of a writing in general: From the nature of holy Writ in particular, which muſt be believed as true, and infallible: From the Editions, and Tranſlations of it: From the difficulty to underſtand

it

it without hazard of Error: From the inconveniences that must follow upon the ascribing of sole Judicature to it: and finally, From the Confessions of our Adversaries. And, on the other side, all these difficulties ceasing, and all other qualities requisite to a Judge concurring in the visible Church of Christ our Lord, we must conclude, that She it is, to whom, in doubts concerning Faith and Religion, all Christians ought to have recourse.

3. The name, notion, nature, and properties of a Judge cannot in common reason agree to any meer writing, which, be it otherwise in it its kind, never so highly qualified with sanctity and infallibility; yet it must ever be, as all writings are, deaf, dumb, and inanimate. By a Judge, all wise men understand a person endued with life, and reason, able to hear, to examine, to declare his mind to the disagreeing parties, in such sort as that each one may know whether the sentence be in favour of his cause, or against his pretence; and he must be applyable, and able to do all this, as the diversity of Controversies, Persons, Occasions, and Circumstances may require. There is a great and plain distinction betwixt a *Judge* and a *Rule*. For, as in a Kingdom, the Judge hath his Rule to follow, which are the received Laws and Customs; so are not they fit orable to declare, or be Judges to themselves, but that office must belong to a living Judge. The holy Scripture may be, and is, a Rule; but cannot be a Judge, because, it being always the same, cannot declare it self any one time, or upon any one occasion, more particularly then upon any other; and let it be read over an hundred times, it will be still the same, and no more fit alone to terminate Controversies in Faith, than the Law would be to end suits, if it were given over to the fancy, and gloss of every single man.

4. This difference betwixt a Judge and a Rule, D. *Potter* perceived, when, more than once having stiled the Scripture a *Judge*, by way of correcting that term, he adds, *or rather a Rule*, because he knew that an inanimate writing could not be a *Judge*. From hence also it was, that, though Protestants in their beginning affirmed Scripture alone to be the Judge of Controversies; yet, upon a more advised reflection, they changed the phrase, and said, that not Scripture, but the Holy Ghost speaking in Scripture, is Judge in Controversies. A difference without a disparity. The Holy Ghost speaking only in Scripture, is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he speaks: as a man speaking only Latin, can be no better understood, than the tongue wherein he speaketh. And therefore to say, A Judge is necessary for deciding Controversies, about the meaning of Scripture, is as much as to say, He is necessary to decide what the holy Ghost speaks in Scripture. And, it were a conceit, equally foolish and pernitious, if one should seek to take away all Judges in the Kingdom, upon this nicety, that, albeit Laws cannot be Judges, yet the Law-maker speaking in the Law, may perform that Office; as if the Law-maker speaking in the Law, were with more perspicuity understood, than the Law whereby he speaketh.

5. But, though some writing were granted to have a priviledge, to declare it self upon supposition that it were maintained in being, and preserved entire from corruptions; yet it is manifest, that no writing can conserve it self, nor can complain, or denounce the falsifier of it; and therefore it stands in need of some watchful and not-erring eye, to guard it, by means of whose assured vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receive it sincere and pure.

6. And, suppose it could defend it self from corruption, how could it assure us that it self were Canonical, and of infallible verity? By saying so? Of this very *Affirmation*, there will remain the same Question still; how it can prove it self to be infallibly true? Neither can there ever be an end of the like multiplyed demands, till we rest in the external Authority of some person or persons bearing witness to the world, that such, or such a Book is Scripture; and yet upon this Point, according to Protestants, all other Controversies in Faith depend.

7. That Scripture cannot assure us, that it self is Canonical Scripture, is acknowledged by some Protestants, in expres words; and by all of them, in deeds. M. *Hooker*, whom D. *Potter* ranketh (a) among men of great *Learning and Judgment*, saith, *Of things* (b) *necessary, the very chiefest is to know what Books we are to esteem Holy; which Point is confessed impossible for the Scripture it self to teach.* And this he proveth by the same Argument, which we lately used, saying thus, *It is not* (c) *the word of God which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think it his Word. For, if any one Book of Scripture did give testimony of all, yet still that Scripture, which giveth testimony to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it. Neither could we come to any pause whereon to rest, unless, besides Scripture, there were something which might assure us, &c.* And this he acknowledges to be the (d) Church. By the way, If, *Of things necessary the very chiefest cannot possibly be taught by Scripture*, as this *man of great learning and judgment affirmeth*, and demonstratively proveth; how can the Protestant Clergy of *England* subscribe to their sixt Article? Wherein it is said of the Scripture, *Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation*: and concerning their belief and profession of this Article, they are particularly examined when they be ordained Priests and Bishops. With *Hooker*, his defendant *Covel* doth punctually agree. *Whitaker* likewise confesseth, that the question about Canonical Scriptures, is defined to us, not by *testimony of the private Spirit*, which (saith he) *being private and secret, is* (e) *unfit to teach and refel others*; but (as he acknowledgeth) *by the* (f) *Ecclesiastical Tradition: An Argument* (saith he) *whereby may be argued, and convinced, what Books be Canonical, and what be not. Luther* saith, *This* (g) *indeed the Church hath, that she can discern the Word of God, from the word of men: as* Augustine *confesseth, that he believed the Gospel, being moved by the Authority of the Church, which did preach this to be the Gospel. Fulk* teacheth, that *the Church* (h) *hath judgement to discern true writings from counterfeit, and the Word of God from the writing of men; and that this judgement she hath not of her self, but of the holy Ghost.* And, to the end that you may not be ignorant, from what Church you must receive Scriptures, hear your first Patriarch *Luther* speaking against them, who (as he saith) brought in *Anabaptism*, that so they might despight the Pope. *Verily* (saith he) *these* (i) *men build upon a weak foundation. For by this means, they ought to deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For, all these we have from the Pope: otherwise we must go make a new Scripture.*

(a) *Pag.* 131.
(b) *In his first book of Eccles. Polity Sect.* 14. *p.* 68.
(c) *Ibid. l.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *p.* 102.
(d) *L.* 3. *Sect.* 8. *pag.* 1. 146. *& alibi.*
(e) *Adv. Stap. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 270. *to p.* 357.
(f) *Adv. Stap. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *p.* 300.
(g) *L. de cap. Bab. to* 2. *Witt. f.* 88.
(h) *In his Answer to a counterfeit Catholique, p.* 5.
(i) *Ep. con. Anab. ad duos Parochos to.* 2. *Ger. Witt.*

8. But

8. But now in deeds, they all make good, that, without the Churches Authority, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical, while they cannot agree in assigning the Canon of holy Scripture. Of the Epistle of S. *James*, *Luther* hath these words: *The* (k) *Epist of* James *is contentious, swelling, dry, strawy, and unworthy of an Apostolical Spirit.* Which censure of *Luther*, *Illyricus* acknowledgeth and maintaineth. *Kemnitius* teacheth, *that the second Epistle* (l) *of* Peter, *the second and third of* John, *the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of* James, *the Epistle of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps of* John *are Apocryphal, as not having sufficient Testimony* (m) *of their authority*, and therefore that *nothing in Controversie can be proved out of these* (n) *Books.* The same is taught by divers other Lutherans: and, if some other amongst them, be of a contrary opinion since *Luther*'s time, I wonder what new infallible ground they can alledge, why they leave their Master, and so many of his prime Schollers? I know no better ground, than because they may with as much freedom abandon him, as he was bold to alter that Canon of Scripture, which he found received in God's Church.

(k) *Præf. in epist. Jac. in ed. Jenen.*
(l) *In Enchirid. p. 63.*
(m) *In exam. Conc. Trid part. 1. p. 55.*
(n) *Ibid.*

9. What Books of Scripture the Protestants of *England*, hold for Canonical, is not easie to affirm. In their *sixth Article* they say, *In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church.* What mean they by these words? That by the Churches consent they are assured what Scriptures be Canonical? This were to make the Church Judge, and not Scriptures alone. Do they only understand the agreement of the Church to be a probable inducement? Probability is no sufficient ground for an infallible assent of Faith. By this rule (*of whose Authority was* NEVER *any doubt in the Church*) the whole book of *Esther* must quit the Canon, because some in the Church have excluded it from the Canon; as (o) *Melito Asianus*, (p) *Athanasius*, and (q) *Gregory Nazianzen.* And *Luther*, (if Protestants will be content that he be *in the Church*) saith, *The Jews* (r) *place the book of* Esther *in the Canon; which yet, if I might be Judge, doth rather deserve to be put out of the Canon.* And of *Ecclesiastes* he saith, *This* (t) *book is not full; there are in it many abrupt things: he wants boots and spurs, that is, he hath no perfect sentence, he rides upon a long reed like me when I was in the Monastery.* And much more is to be read in him: who (t) saith further, that the said book was not written by *Solomon*, but by *Syrach* in the time of the *Macchabees*, and that it is like to the *Talmud* (the Jews Bible) *out of many books heaped into one work, perhaps out of the Library of King* Ptolomæus. And further he saith, that (u) he doth not believe all to have been done as there is set down. And he teacheth the (w) book of *Job* to be *as it were, an argument for a Fable* (or Comedy) *to set before us an example of Patience.* And he (x) delivers this general censure of the Prophets Books, *The Sermons of no Prophet were written whole and perfect, but their Disciples, and Auditors snatched, now one sentence, and then another, and so put them all into one book, and by this means the Bible was conserved.* If this were so, the books of the Prophets, being not written by themselves, but promiscuously and casually, by their Disciples, will soon be called in question. Are not these errors of *Luther* fundamental? and yet, if Protestants deny the Infallibility of the Church, upon what certain ground can they disprove these *Lutherian*, and *Luciferian* blasphemies? O godly Reformer of the Roman Church! But to return to our English Canon of Scripture. In the New Testament by the above-mentioned rule (*of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church*) divers Books of the New Testament must be dis-canonized, to wit, all those of which some Ancients have doubted, and those which divers *Lutherans* have of late denied. It is worth the observation, how the before-mentioned *sixth Article*, doth specifie by name all the Books of the *Old Testament* which they hold for Canonical; but those of the *New Testament*, *as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical.* The Mysterie is easily to be unfolded. If they had descended to particulars, they must have contradicted some of their chiefest Brethren. *As they are commonly received*, &c. I ask, By whom? By the Church of *Rome*? Then, by the same reason they must receive divers Books of the Old Testament, which they reject. By *Lutherans*? Then with *Lutherans* they may deny some Books of the New Testament. If it be the greater, or less number of Voices, that must cry up or down, the Canon of Scripture, our *Roman* Canon will prevail: and among Protestants the *Certainty* of their *Faith* must be reduced to an *uncertain* Controversie of *Fact*, Whether the number of those who reject, or of those others who receive such and such Scriptures, be greater. Their Faith must alter according to years and days. When *Luther* first appeared, he, and his Disciples were the greater number of that new Church; and so this claim (*Of being commonly received*) stood for them, till *Zuinglius* or *Calvin* grew to some equal, or greater number than that of the *Lutherans*, and then this rule of (*Commonly received*) will canonize their Canon against the *Lutherans.* I would gladly know, why, in the former part of their Article, they say both of the *Old and New Testament: In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; And in the latter part, speaking again of the *New Testament*, they give a far different rule, saying, *All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.* This, I say, is a rule much different from the former (*of whose Authority was* NEVER *any doubt in the Church.*) For some Books might be said to be *Commonly received*, although they were *sometime* doubted of *by some.* If to be *Commonly received*, pass for a good rule to know the Canon of the *New Testament*, why not of the *Old*? Above all we desire to know, Upon what infallible ground in some Books they agree with us against *Luther*, and divers principal *Lutherans*, and in others jump with *Luther* against us? But seeing they disagree among themselves, it is evident that they have no certain rule to know the Canon of Scripture, in assigning whereof some of them must of necessity err; because, of contradictory Propositions both cannot be true.

(o) *Apud Euseb. l. 4 hist. c. 26*
(p) *In Synop.*
(q) *In carm. de genuinis Scrip.*
(r) *Li. de serv. arb. con. Eras. tom. 2 Wit. fol. 471.*
(t) *In lat. Jerm. conviviali. us Franc. in 8. imp. Anno 1571.*
(u) *In Ger. colloq. Lutheri ab Aurifabro ed. Fran. tit. de lib. vet. & nov. Test. fol. 379.*
(w) *Tit. de li. Vet. & Nov. Test.*
(x) *Fol. 380.*

10. Moreover, the letters, syllables, words, phrase, or matter contained in holy Scripture have no necessary, or natural connection with divine *Revelation* or *Inspiration*: and therefore by seeing, reading, or understanding them, we cannot inferr that they proceed from God, or be confirmed by divine Authority; as because *Creatures* involve a necessary relation, connection, and dependance on their *Creator*, Philosophers may by the light of natural reason, demonstrate the existence of one prime cause of all things. In Holy Writ there are innumerable truths not surpassing the sphear of humane wit, which are, or

may be delivered by Pagan Writers, in the ſelf ſame words and phraſe as they are in Scripture. And as for ſome truths peculiar to Chriſtians (for example, the myſterie of the bleſſed Trinity, &c.) The only ſetting them down in *Writing* is not enough to be aſſured that ſuch a *Writing* is the undoubted Word of God: otherwiſe ſome ſayings of *Plato*, *Triſmegiſtus*, *Sibyls*, *Ovid*, &c. muſt be eſteemed Canonical Scripture, becauſe they fall upon ſome truths proper to Chriſtian Religion. The internal *light*, and *inſpiration*, which directed and moved the Authors of Canonical Scriptures, is a hidden *Quality* infuſed into their underſtanding and will, and hath no ſuch particular ſenſible influence into the external *Writing*, that *in it* we can diſcover, or *from it* demonſtrate any ſuch ſecret *light* and *inſpiration*; and therefore to be aſſured that ſuch a *Writing* is divine, we cannot know from it ſelf alone, but by ſome other extrinſecal Authority.

11. And here we appeal to any man of judgement, whether it be not a vain brag of ſome Proteſtants to tell us, that they wot full well what is Scripture, by the light of Scripture it ſelf, or (as D. *Potter* words it) *by* (y) *that glorious beam of divine light which ſhines therein*; even as our eye diſtinguiſheth light from darkneſs, without any other help than light it ſelf; and as our ear knows a voice, by the voice it ſelf alone. But this vanity is refuted, by what we ſaid even now; that the external Scripture hath no apparent or neceſſary connexion with divine *inſpiration* or *revelation*. Will D. *Potter* hold all his Brethren for blind men, for not ſeeing *that glorious beam of divine light which ſhines in Scripture*, about which they cannot agree? Corporal light may be diſcerned by it ſelf alone, as being evident, proportionate, and connatural to our faculty of ſeeing. That Scripture is Divine, and inſpired by God, is a truth exceeding the natural capacity and compaſs of man's underſtanding, to us obſcure, and to be believed by divine Faith, which, according to the *Apoſtle*, is, *argumentum* (z) *non-apparentium*; *an argument*, or conviction, *of things not evident*; and therefore no wonder if Scripture do not manifeſt it ſelf by it ſelf alone, but muſt require ſome other means for applying it to our underſtanding. Nevertheleſs their own ſimilitudes and inſtances make againſt themſelves. For, ſuppoſe a man had never read, or heard of Sun, Moon, Fire, Candle, &c. and ſhould be brought to behold a light, yet in ſuch ſort as that the Agent, or Cauſe efficient from which it proceeded, were kept hidden from him; could ſuch a one, by only beholding the light, certainly know, Whether it were produced by the Sun, or Moon, &c? Or, if one hear a voice, and had never known the Speaker, could he know from whom in particular that voice proceeded? They, who look upon Scripture, may well ſee, that ſome one wrote it; but that it was written by divine inſpiration, how ſhall they know? Nay, they cannot ſo much as know who wrote it, unleſs they firſt know the Writer, and what hand he writes: as likewiſe I cannot know whoſe voice it is which I hear, unleſs I firſt both know the perſon who ſpeaks, and with what voice he uſeth to ſpeak; and yet, even all this ſuppoſed, I may perhaps be deceived. For there may be Voices ſo like, and Hand ſo counterfeited, that men may be deceived by them, as birds were by the Grapes of that skilful Painter. Now ſince Proteſtants affirm, knowledge concerning God as our *ſupernatural* end, muſt be taken from Scripture, they cannot in Scripture alone diſcern that it is his voice, or writing, becauſe they cannot know from whom a writing, or voice proceeds, unleſs firſt they know the perſon who ſpeaketh, or writeth. Nay, I ſay more, by Scripture alone, they cannot ſo much as know, that any perſon doth in it, or by it, ſpeak any thing at all: becauſe one may write without intent to ſignifie, or affirm any thing, but only to ſet down, or, as it were, paint, ſuch characters, ſyllables, and words; as men are wont to ſet copies, not caring what the ſignification of the words imports: or as one tranſcribes a writing which himſelf underſtands not: or when one writes what another dictates, and in other ſuch caſes, wherein it is clear, that the Writer ſpeaks or ſignifies nothing in ſuch his writing; and therefore by *it* we cannot hear, or underſtand *his* voice. With what certainty then can any man affirm, that by Scripture it ſelf they can ſee, that the Writers did intend to ſignifie any thing at all: that they were Apoſtles, or other Canonical Authors: that they wrote their own ſenſe, and not what was dictated by ſome other man: and finally and eſpecially, that they wrote by the infallible direction of the holy Ghoſt?

12. But let us be liberal, and for the preſent ſuppoſe (not grant) that Scripture is, like to corporal light, by it ſelf alone able to determine, and move our underſtanding to aſſent; yet the Similitude proves againſt themſelves. For light is not viſible, except to ſuch as have eyes, which are not made by the light, but muſt be preſuppoſed as produced by ſome other cauſe. And therefore, to hold the ſimilitude, Scripture can be clear only to thoſe who are endued with the eye of Faith; or, as D *Potter* above cited ſaith, to all that *have* (a) *eyes to diſcern the ſhining beams thereof*; that is, to the *believer*, as immediately after he ſpeaketh. Faith then muſt not originally proceed from Scripture, but is to be preſuppoſed, before we can ſee the light thereof; and conſequently there muſt be ſome other means precedent to Scripture, to beget Faith, which can be no other than the Church.

13. Others affirm, that they know Canonical Scriptures to be ſuch, by the *Title* of the Books. But how ſhall we know ſuch *Inſcriptions*, or *Titles*, to be infallibly true? From this their Anſwer our Argument is ſtrengthned, becauſe divers Apocryphal writings have appeared, under the *Titles*, and Names of ſacred Authors, as the Goſpel of *Thomas* mentioned by (b) S. *Auguſtine*, the Goſpel of *Peter*, which the *Nazarei* did uſe, as (c) *Theodoret* witneſſeth, with which *Seraphion* a Catholique Biſhop, was for ſome time deceived, as may be read in (d) *Euſebius*, who alſo ſpeaketh of the *Apocalyps* of (e) *Peter*. The like may be ſaid of the Goſpels of *Barnabas*, *Bartholomew*, and other ſuch writings ſpecified by Pope (f) *Gelaſius*. Proteſtants reject likewiſe ſome part of *Eſther* and *Daniel*, which bear the ſame *Titles* with the reſt of thoſe Books, as alſo both we, and they hold for Apocryphal, the third and fourth Books which go under the name of *Eſdras*, and yet both of us receive his firſt and ſecond book. Wherefore Titles are not ſufficient aſſurances what Books be Canonical: which (h) D. *Covel* acknowledgeth in theſe words, *It is not the Word of God, which doth, or poſſibly can aſſure us, that we do well to think it is the Word of God: the firſt outward motion leading men ſo to eſteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church, which teacheth us to receive Mark's Goſpel, who was not an Apoſtle, and to refuſe the Goſpel of* Thomas *who was an Apoſtle: and to retain* Luke's *Goſpel who ſaw not Chriſt, and to reject the Goſpel of* Nicodemus *who ſaw him.*

(y) *Pag.* 141.

(z) *Heb.* v. 1.

(a) *Pag.* 141.

(b) *Cont. Adimantum c.* 17.
(c) *L.* 2. *hæretic. fab.*
(d) *Li.* 6. *c.* 10.
(e) *Lib.* 6. *c.* 11.
(f) *Diſt. Can. Sancta Romana.*
(h) *In his defence, art.* 4. *pag.* 31.

14. Another

14. Another Anſwer, or rather Objection they are wont to bring: That the Scripture being a *principle needs no proof among Chriſtians*. So (i) D. *Potter*. But this is either a plain begging of the queſtion, or manifeſtly untrue, and is directly againſt their own Doctrin, and Practice. If they mean, that Scripture is one of thoſe principles, which being the firſt, and the moſt known in all Sciences, cannot be demonſtrated by other principles, they ſuppoſe that which is in queſtion, Whether there be not ſome Principle, (for example, the Church) whereby we may come to the knowledg of Scripture. If they intend, that Scripture is a Principle, but not the firſt, and moſt known in Chriſtianity, then Scripture may be proved. For Principles, that are not the firſt, nor known of themſelves, may, and ought to be proved, before we can yield aſſent, either to them, or to other verities depending on them. It is repugnant to their own Doctrine, and practice, in as much as they are wont to affirm, that one part of Scripture may be known to be Canonical, and may be interpreted by another. And ſince every Scripture is a Principle ſufficient, upon which to ground divine Faith, they muſt grant, that one Principle may, and ſometime muſt, be proved by another. Yea this their Anſwer, upon due ponderation, fals out to prove, what we affirm. For ſince all Principles cannot be proved, we muſt (that our labour may not be endleſs) come at length, to reſt in ſome Principle, which may not require any other proof. Such is *Tradition*, which involves an evidence of fact; and from hand to hand, and age to age, bringing us up to the *times*, and *Perſons* of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true. Wherefore the ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the ſacred Canon upon the credit of God's Church. (k) S. *Athanaſius* ſaith, that only four Goſpels are to be received, becauſe the *Canons of the holy and Catholique Church have ſo determined*. The third Councel of (l) *Carthage* having ſet down the Books of holy Scripture, gives the reaſon, becauſe, *We have received from our Fathers that theſe are to be read in the Church*. S. *Auguſtine* (m) ſpeaking of the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, ſaith, *To which book I muſt give credit, if I give credit to the Goſpel, becauſe the Catholique Church doth alike recommend to me both theſe Books*. And in the ſame place he hath alſo theſe words: *I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the authority of the Catholique Church did move me*. A ſaying ſo plain, that *Zuinglius* is forced to cry out, *Here I* (n) *implore your equity to ſpeak freely, whether this ſaying of* Auguſtine *ſeem not over-bold, or elſe unadviſedly to have fallen from him*.

i Pag. 234.

k *In Synopſi.*

l *Can.* 47.

m *Cont. ep. Fundam. c.* 5.

n *To.* 1. *fol.* 135.

15. But ſuppoſe they were aſſured what Books were Canonical, this will little avail them, unleſs they be likewiſe certain in what language they remain uncorrupted, or what *Tranſlations* be true. *Calvin* (o) acknowledgeth corruption in the Hebrew Text; which if it be taken without points, is ſo ambiguous, that ſcarcely any one Chapter, yea period, can be ſecurely underſtood without the help of ſome Tranſlation. If with points, Theſe were after S. *Hieroms* time, invented by the perfidious *Jews*, who either by ignorance might miſtake, or upon malice force the Text, to favour their impieties. And that the Hebrew Text ſtill retains much ambiguity, is apparent by the diſagreeing *Tranſlation* of *Noveliſts*; which alſo proves the Greek, for the New Teſtament, not to be void of doubtfulneſs, as *Calvin* (p) confeſſeth it to be corrupted. And although both the Hebrew and Greek were pure, what doth this help, if only Scripture be the rule of Faith, and ſo very few be able to examine the Text in theſe languages. All then muſt be reduced to the certainty of *Tranſlations* into other Tongues, wherein no private man having any promiſe, or aſſurance of Infallibility, Proteſtants who rely upon Scripture alone, will find no certain ground for their faith: as accordingly *Whitaker* (q) affirmeth: *Thoſe who underſtand not the Hebrew and Greek, do erre often, and unavoidably*.

o *Inſtit. c.* 6. *Sect.* 11.

p *Inſtit. c.* 7. *Sect.* 12.

q *Lib. de ſancta Scriptura p.* 52.

16. Now concerning the Tranſlations of Proteſtants, it will be ſufficient to ſet down what the laborious, exact, and judicious Author of the *Proteſtants Apology*, &c. dedicated to our late King *James* of famous memory, hath to this (r) purpoſe. To omit (ſaith he) particulars, whoſe recital would be infinite, and to touch this point but generally only, The Tranſlation of the New Teſtament by *Luther* is condemned by *Andreas*, *Oſiander*, *Keckermannus*, and *Zuinglius*, who ſaith hereof to *Luther*, *Thou doſt corrupt the Word of God, thou art ſeen to be a manifeſt and common corrupter of the holy Scriptures: how much are we aſhamed of thee who have hitherto eſteemed thee beyond all meaſure, and now prove thee to be ſuch a man?* And in like manner doth *Luther* reject the Tranſlation of the *Zuinglians*, terming them in matter of Divinity, Fools, Aſſes, Antichriſts, Deceivers, and of Aſſe-like underſtanding. In ſo much that when *Froſchoverus* the *Zuinglian* Printer of *Zurich* ſent him a Bible tranſlated by the Divines there, *Luther* would not receive the ſame, but ſending it back rejected it, as the Proteſtants Writers *Hoſpinianus*, and *Lavaterus*, witneſs. The Tranſlation ſet forth by *Oecolampadius*, and the Divines of *Baſil*, is reproved by *Beza*, who affirmeth that the *Baſil Tranſlation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mind of the holy Ghoſt*. The Tranſlation of *Caſtalio* is condemned by *Beza*, as being *ſacrilegious, wicked*, and *Ethnical*. As concerning *Calvins* Tranſlation, that learned Proteſtant Writer *Carolus Molinæus* ſaith thereof, *Calvin in his Harmony maketh the Text of the Goſpel to leap up and down: he uſeth violence to the letter of the Goſpel; and, beſides this, addeth to the Text*. As touching *Beza's* Tranſlation, (to omit the diſlike had thereof by *Selneccerus* the *German* Proteſtant of the Univerſity of *Jena*) the foreſaid *Molinæus* ſaith of him, *de facto mutat textum; he actually changeth the text*, and giveth farther ſundry inſtances of his corruptions: as alſo *Caſtalio* that learned Calviniſt, and moſt learned in the tongues, reprehendeth *Beza* in a whole Book, of this matter, and ſaith, that to note all his errors in tranſlation, *would require a great volume*. And M. *Parkes* ſaith, *As for the Geneva Bibles, it is to be wiſhed that either they may be purged from thoſe manifold errors, which are both in the text, and in the margent; or elſe utterly prohibited*. All which confirmeth your Majeſties grave and learned Cenſure, in your *thinking the* Geneva *tranſlation to be worſt of all*; and that in the *Marginal notes annexed to the* Geneva *tranſlation, ſome are very partial, untrue, ſeditious*, &c. Laſtly, concerning the *Engliſh* tranſlation, the Puritans ſay, *Our tranſlation of the Pſalms, comprized in our Book of Common-Prayer, doth in addition, ſubſtraction, and alteration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew, in two hundred places at the leaſt*. In ſo much as they do therefore profeſs to reſt doubtful, *whether a man with a ſafe conſcience may ſubſcribe thereunto* And M. *Carlile* ſaith of the *Engliſh* tranſlators, that they have *depraved the ſenſe, obſcured the truth, and deceived the ignorant, that in many places*

r *Taſt.* 1. *Sect.* 10. *ſubd.* 4. joyned with *Tract.* 2 *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 10. *ſubd.* 2.

they do detort the Scriptures from the right ſenſe. And that, *they ſhew themſelves to love darkneſs more than light, falſhood more than truth.* And the Miniſters of *Lincoln*-Dioceſs, give their publique teſtimony, terming the *Engliſh* Tranſlation, *A Tranſlation that taketh away from the Text; that addeth to the Text; and that ſometime to the changing, or obſcuring, of the meaning of the holy Ghoſt.* Not without cauſe therefore, did your Majeſty affirm, that you *could never ſee a Bible well Tranſlated into Engliſh.* Thus farr the *Author* of the *Proteſtants Apologie*, &c. And I cannot forbear to mention, in particular, that famous corruption of *Luther*, who in the Text, where it is ſaid (*Rom.3.v.28. We account a man to be juſtified by faith, without the works of the Law*) in favour of Juſtification by faith *alone*, tranſlateth (*juſtified by faith ALONE.*) As likewiſe the falſification of *Zuinglius* is no leſs nororious, who in the Goſpels of S. *Matthew*, *Marke*, and *Luke*, and in S. *Paul*, in place of, *This is my Body, this is my Bloud*, tranſlates, *This ſignifies my Body, this ſignifies my Bloud.* And here let Proteſtants conſider duely of theſe Points. Salvation cannot be hoped for, without true Faith: Faith, according to them, relies upon Scripture alone: Scripture muſt be delivered to moſt of them, by the Tranſlations: Tranſlations depend on the skill and honeſty of men, in whom nothing is more certain than a moſt certain poſſibility to err, and no greater evidence of truth, than that it is evident ſome of them embrace falſhood, by reaſon of their contrary Tranſlations. What then remaineth, but that Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground? How many poor ſouls are lamentably ſeduced, while from preaching Miniſters, they admire a multitude of Texts of divine Scripture, but are indeed the falſe Tranſlations, and corruptions of erring men? Let them therefore, if they will be aſſured of true Scriptures, flye to the alwayes viſible Catholique Church, againſt which the gates of hell can never ſo farr prevail, as that ſhe ſhall be permitted to deceive the Chriſtian world with falſe Scriptures. And *Luther* himſelf, by unfortunate experience, was at length forced to confeſs thus much, ſaying, *If the* (ſ) *world laſt longer, it will be again neceſſary to receive the Decrees of Councels, and to have recourſe to them, by reaſon of divers interpretations of Scripture which now raign.* On the contrary ſide, the Tranſlation approved by the *Roman*-Church, is commended even by our Adverſaries: and D. *Covell* in particular ſaith, *that it was uſed in the Church, one thouſand* (t) *three hundred years ago*, and doubteth not *to prefer* (u) *that Tranſlation before others.* In ſo much, that whereas the *Engliſh*-Tranſlations be many, and among themſelves diſagreeing, he concludeth, that of all thoſe *the approved Tranſlation authorized by the Church of* England, *is that which cometh neareſt to the vulgar, and is commonly called the Biſhops Bible.* So that the truth of that Tranſlation which we uſe, muſt be the rule to judge of the goodneſs of their Bibles: and therefore they are obliged to maintain our Tranſlation, if it were but for their own ſake.

ſ *Li.cont. Zuing. de verit. corp. Chriſt.in Eucha.*

t In his anſwer unto M. *John Burges*, pag.94.

u *Ibid.*

17. But doth indeed the ſource of their manifold uncertainties ſtop here? No, The chiefeſt difficulty remains, concerning the true meaning of Scripture: for attaining whereof, if Proteſtants had any certainty, they could not diſagree ſo hugely as they do. Hence Mr. *Hooker* ſaith, *We are* (w) *right ſure of this, that Nature, Scripture, and Experience have all taught the world to ſeek for the ending of contentions, by ſubmitting it ſelf unto ſome judicial, and definitive ſentence, whereunto neither part that contendeth may, under any pretence, refuſe to ſtand.* Doctor *Fields* words are remarkable to this purpoſe, *Seeing* (ſaith he) *the Controverſies* (x) *of Religion in our times are grown in number ſo many, and in nature ſo intricate, that few have time and leiſure, fewer ſtrength of underſtanding, to examine them; what remaineth for men deſirous of ſatisfaction in things of ſuch conſequence, but diligently to ſearch out which among all the ſocieties in the world, is that bleſſed company of holy ones, that houſhold of Faith, that Spouſe of Chriſt, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that ſo they may imbrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and reſt in her Judgement?*

w In his Preface to his Books of *Eccl. Politie*, Sect. 6.26.

x In his Treatiſe of the Church in his Epiſtle dedicatory to the L. Archbiſhop.

18. And now that the true Interpretation of Scripture ought to be received from the Church, it is alſo proved by what we have already demonſtrated, that ſhe it is, who muſt declare what Books be true Scripture; wherein if ſhe be aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt, Why ſhould we not believe her, to be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of them? Let Proteſtants therefore either bring ſome proof out of Scripture, that the Church is guided by the holy Ghoſt in diſcerning true Scripture, and not in delivering the true ſenſe thereof; Or elſe give us leave to apply againſt them, the argument which S. *Auguſtine* oppoſed to the *Manicheans*, in theſe words, *I would not* (y) *believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying, Believe the Goſpel, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, Do not believe* Manicheus, (Luther, Calvin, &c.) *Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt. If thou ſhalt ſay, Believe the Catholiques; They warn me, not to give any credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay, Do not believe the Catholiques, thou ſhalt not do well in forcing me to the faith of* Manicheus, *becauſe, by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Goſpel it ſelf. If thou ſay, You did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Goſpel, but you did not well to believe them, diſcommending* Manicheus; *Doſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that, without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* And do not Proteſtants perfectly reſemble theſe men, to whom S. *Auguſtine* ſpake, when they will have men to believe the *Roman*-Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning *Luther*, and the reſt? Againſt whom, when they firſt oppoſed themſelves to the *Roman*-Church, S. *Auguſtine* may ſeem to have ſpoken no leſs Prophetically, than Doctrinally, when he ſaid, *Why ſhould I not moſt* (z) *diligently inquire what Chriſt commanded of them before all others, by whoſe authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing? Canſt thou better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by thee to me? This therefore I believed by fame, ſtrengthened with celebrity, conſent, Antiquity. But every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving authority. What madneſs is this? Believe them* (Catholiques), *that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us, what Chriſt ſaid. Why, I beſeech thee? Surely if they* (Catholiques) *were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſwade my ſelf, that I were not to believe Chriſt, than that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him from any other than them by whom I believed him.* If therefore we receive the knowledge

y *Con.Ep. Fund. cap. 5.*

z *Lib. de util. cre. Cap. 14.*

knowledge of Christ, and Scriptures from the Church, from her also must we take his Doctrine, and the interpretation thereof.

19. But besides all this, the Scriptures cannot be Judge of Controversies; who ought to be such, as that to him not only the learned, or Veterans, but also the unlearned, and Novices, may have recourse: for these being capable of Salvation, and endued with Faith of the same nature with that of the learned, there must be some universal Judge, which the ignorant may understand, and to whom the greatest Clerks must submit. Such is the Church; and the Scripture is not such.

20. Now, the inconveniences which follow by referring all Controversies to Scripture *alone*, are very clear. For by this Principle, all is finally in very deed and truth reduced to the *internal private Spirit*, because there is really no middle way betwixt a *publique external*, and a *private internal* voice; and whosoever refuseth the one, must of necessity adhere to the other.

21. This Tenet also of Protestants, by taking the office of Judicature from the Church, comes to conferr it upon every particular man, who being driven from submission to the Church, cannot be blamed if he trust himself as farr as any other, his conscience dictating, that wittingly he means not to cozen himself, as others maliciously may do. Which inference is so manifest, that it hath extorted from divers Protestants the open confession of so vast an absurdity. Hear *Luther*, *The Governors of* (a) *Churches, and Pastors of Christs Sheep, have indeed power to teach, but the Sheep ought to give judgement, whether they propound the voice of Christ, or of Alieas. Lubertus* saith, *As we have* (b) *demonstrated that all publique Judges may be deceived in interpreting; so we affirm, that they may err in judging. All faithful men are private Judges, and they also have power to judge of Doctrins, and interpretations. Whitaker*, even of the unlearned, saith, *They* (c) *ought to have recourse unto the more learned; but in the mean time we must be careful not to attribute to them over-much, but so, that still we retain our own freedom. Bilson* also affirmeth, that, *The people* (d) *must be discerners, and Judges of that which is taught.* The same pernicious Doctrine is delivered by *Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright*, and others exactly cited by (e) *Breerely*; and nothing is more common in every Protestants mouth, than that he admits of Fathers, Councels, Church, *&c.* as far as they agree with Scripture; which upon the matter is himself. Thus *Heresie* ever falls upon extreams. It pretends to have Scripture alone for Judge of Controversies, and in the mean time sets up as many Judges, as there are men and women in the Christian world. What good Statesmen would they be, who should ideate, or fancy, such a Common-wealth, as these men have framed to themselves a Church? They verifie what S. *Augustine* objecteth against certain Heretiques. *You see* (f) *that you go about to overthrow all authority of Scripture, and that every mans mind may be to himself a Rule, what he is to allow, or disallow in every Scripture.*

a To. 2. *Wittemb.* fol. 375.
b *In lib de principiis Christian. dogm. li 6. c. 13.*
c *De sacra Scriptura pag.* 529.
d In his true Difference, part 2.
e *Tract. 2. cap. 1 Sect. 1.*
f *Lib. 32. cont. Faust.*

22. Moreover, what confusion to the Church, what danger to the Common-wealth, this denial of the Authority of the Church, may bring, I leave to the consideration of any judicious, indifferent man. I will only set down some words of D. *Potter*, who speaking of the Proposition of revealed Truths, sufficient to prove him that gain-saith them, to be an Heretique, saith thus: *This Proposition* (g) *of revealed truths, is not by the infallible determination of Pope, or Church;* (Pope, and Church being excluded, let us hear what more secure rule he will prescribe) *but by whatsoever means a man may be convinced in conscience of divine Revelation. If a Preacher do clear any Point of Faith to his Hearers; if a private Christian do make it appear to his Neighbour, that any Conclusion, or Point of Faith is delivered by divine revelation of Gods Word; if a man himself* (without any Teacher) *by reading the Scriptures, or hearing them read, be convinced of the truth of any such Conclusion; this is a sufficient Proposition to prove him that gainsayeth any such proof, to be an Heretique, and obstinate opposer of the Faith.* Behold, what goodly safe Propounders of Faith arise in place of Gods universal visible Church, which must yield to a single Preacher, a Neighbour, a man himself if he can read, or at least have ears to hear Scripture read. Verily I do not see, but that every well-governed civil Common-wealth, ought to concur towards the exterminating of this Doctrin, whereby the Interpretation of Scripture is taken from the Church, and conferred upon every man, who, whatsoever is pretended to the contrary, may be a passionate seditious creature.

g Pag. 247.

23. Moreover, there was no Scripture, or written Word for about two thousand years from *Adam* to *Moses*, whom all acknowledge to have been the first Author of Canonical Scripture: And again, for about two thousand years more, from *Moses* to Christ our Lord, holy Scripture was only among the people of *Israel*; and yet there were *Gentiles* endued in those dayes with divine Faith, as appeareth in *Job*, and his friends Wherefore, during so many Ages, the Church alone was the Decider of Controversies, and Instructor of the faithful. Neither did the Word written by *Moses*, deprive the Church of her former Infallibility, or other qualities requisite for a Judge: yea D. *Potter* acknowledgeth, that besides the *Law*, there was a living *Judge* in the *Jewish* Church, endued with an *absolutely infallible direction in case of moment*; as all Points belonging to divine Faith are. Now, the Church of Christ our Lord, was before the Scriptures of the New Testament, which were not written instantly, nor all at one time, but successively upon several occasions; and some after the decease of most of the Apostles: and after they were written, they were not presently known to all Churches: and of some there was doubt in the Church for some Ages after our Saviour. Shall we then say, that according as the Church by little and little received holy Scripture, she was by the like degrees devested of her possessed Infallibility, and power to decide Controversies in Religion? That sometime Churches had one Judge of Controversies, and others another? That with moneths, or years, as new Canonical Scripture grew to be published, the Church altered her whole Rule of Faith, or Judge of Controversies? After the Apostles time, and after the writing of Scriptures, Heresies would be sure to rise, requiring in God's Church, for their discovery and condemnation, *Infallibility*, either to write new Canonical Scripture, as was done in the Apostles time by occasion of emergent Heresies; or *Infallibility* to interpret Scriptures, already written, or without Scripture, by divine unwritten Traditions, and assistance of the holy Ghost to determine all Controversies, as *Tertullian* saith: *The soul is* (h) *before the letter, and speech before Books; and sense before style.* Certainly such *addition* of Scripture, with derogation,

h *De test. anim. cap. 5.*

or *ſubſtraction* from the former power and infallibility of the Church, would have brought to the world *diviſion* in matters of faith, and the Church had rather loſt, than gained by holy Scripture, (which ought to be farr from our tongues and thoughts) it being manifeſt, that, for deciſion of Controverſies, Infallibility ſeated in a living Judge, is incomparably more uſeful and fit, than if it were conceived, as inherent in ſome inanimate writing. Is there ſuch repugnance betwixt Infallibility of the Church, and Exiſtence of Scripture, that the *production* of the one, muſt be the *deſtruction* of the other? Muſt the Church wax dry, by giving to her Children the milk of ſacred Writ? No, No. Her Infallibility was, and is, derived from an inexhauſted Fountain. If *Proteſtants* will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them firſt produce ſome Scripture affirming, that by the *entring* thereof, Infallibility *went out* of the Church. D. *Potter* may remember what himſelf teacheth; That the Church is ſtill endued with Infallibility in Points Fundamental; and conſequently, that Infallibility in the Church doth well agree with the truth, the ſanctity, yea with the ſufficiency, of Scripture, for all matters neceſſary to Salvation. I would therefore gladly know, out of what Text he imagineth that the Church by the coming of Scripture, was deprived of Infallibility in ſome Points, and not in others? He affirmeth, that the *Jewiſh* Synagogue retained infallibility in her ſelf, notwithſtanding the writing of the *Old* Teſtament; and will he ſo unworthily and unjuſtly deprive the Church of Chriſt of Infallibility by reaſon of the *New* Teſtament? Eſpecially, if we conſider, that, in the Old Teſtament, Laws, Ceremonies, Rites, Puniſhments, Judgements, Sacraments, Sacrifices, *&c.* were more particularly, and minutely delivered to the *Jews*, than in the New Teſtament is done; our Saviour leaving the determination or declaration, of particulars to his Spouſe the Church, which therefore ſtands in need of Infallibility more than the *Jewiſh* Synagogue.

i Pag. 24. D. *Potter* (i) againſt this argument, drawn from the power and infallibility of the Synagogue, objects, That we might as well inferr, that *Chriſtians muſt have one Soveraign Prince over all, becauſe the Jews had one chief Judge*. But the diſparity is very clear. The Synagogue was a type, and figure of the Church of Chriſt; not ſo their civil Government, of Chriſtian Common-wealths or Kingdoms. The Church ſucceeded to the Synagogue, but not Chriſtian Princes to *Jewiſh* Magiſtrates: And the Church is compared to a houſe, or (k) family; to an (l) Army, to a (m) body, to a (n) kingdom, *&c.* all which require one Maſter, one General, one head, one Magiſtrate, one ſpiritual King; as our bleſſed Saviour with *fiet unum ovile*, (o) joyned *unus Paſtor: One Sheepfold One Paſtour*: But all diſtinct Kingdoms, or Common-wealths, are not one Army, Family, *&c.* And finally, it is neceſſary to Salvation, that all have recourſe to one Church; but for temporal weale, there is no need that all ſubmit, or depend upon one temporal Prince, Kingdom, or Common-wealth: and therefore our Saviour hath left to his whole Church, as being *One*, one Law, one Scripture, the ſame Sacraments, *&c.* Whereas Kingdoms have their ſeveral Laws, different governments, diverſity of Powers, Magiſtracy, *&c.* And ſo this objection returneth upon D. *Potter*. For as in the *One* Community of the *Jews*, there was one Power and Judge, to end debates, and reſolve difficulties; ſo in the Church of Chriſt, which is *One*, there muſt be ſome *one* Authority to decide all Controverſies in Religion.

k Heb. 13.
l Cant. 2.
m 1 Cor. 10. Epheſ. 4.
n Mat. 12.
o *Joan. c.* 10.

p *Lib. 5. c. 4.* 24. This Diſcourſe is excellently proved by ancient S. *Irenæus* (p) in theſe words; *What if the Apoſtles had not left Scriptures, ought we not to have followed the order of Tradition which they delivered to thoſe to whom they committed the Churches? to which order many Nations yield aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having Salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit of God, without letters or Inke, and diligent keeping ancient Tradition. It is eaſie to receive the truth from God's Church, ſeeing the Apoſtles have moſt fully depoſited in her, as in a rich ſtore-houſe, all things belonging to truth. For what? if there ſhould ariſe any contention of ſome ſmall queſtion, ought we not to have recourſe to the moſt ancient Churches, and from them to receive what is certain and clear concerning the preſent queſtion?*

25. Beſides all this, the doctrine of Proteſtants is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means, not to err in interpreting Scripture; or they have not. If not, then the Scripture (to them) cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible Faith, nor a meet Judge of Controverſies. If they have certain infallible means, and ſo cannot err in their interpretations of Scriptures; then they are able with infallibility to hear, examine, and determine all Controverſies of Faith; and ſo they may be, and are *Judges* of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a *Rule*. And thus, againſt their own doctrin, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies, beſides Scripture alone.

26. Laſtly, I ask D. *Potter*, Whether this Aſſertion (*Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith*) be a fundamental Point of Faith, or no? He muſt be well adviſed, before he ſay, that it is a Fundamental Point. For he will have againſt him, as many Proteſtants as teach that by Scripture alone, it is impoſſible to know what Books be Scripture, which yet, to Proteſtants, is the moſt neceſſary and chief Point of all other. D. *Covell* expreſly ſaith, *Doubtleſs* (q) *it is a tolerable opinion in the Church of* Rome, *if they go no further, as ſome of them do not* (he ſhould have ſaid, as none of them do) *to affirm, that the Scriptures are holy and divine in themſelves, but ſo eſteemed by us, for the authority of the Church*. He will likewiſe oppoſe himſelf to thoſe his Brethren, who grant that Controverſies cannot be ended, without ſome external living Authority, as we noted before. Beſides, how can it be in us a fundamental Error to ſay, the Scripture alone is not Judge of Controverſies, ſeeing (notwithſtanding this our belief) we uſe for interpreting of Scripture, all the means which they preſcribe; as Prayer, Conferring of places, Conſulting the Originals, *&c.* and to theſe add the Inſtruction, and Authority of God's Church, which even by his confeſſion *cannot* err damnably, and *may* afford us more *help*, than can be expected from the induſtry, learning, or wit of any private perſon: and finally, D. *Potter* grants, that the Church of *Rome* doth not maintain any fundamental error againſt Faith; and conſequently, he cannot affirm that our doctrin, in this preſent Controverſie, is damnable. If he anſwer, that their Tenet, about the *Scriptures* being *the only Judge of Controverſies*, is not a Fundamental Point of Faith: then, as he teacheth, that the univerſal Church may err in Points Fundamental; ſo, I hope, he will not deny, but particular Churches, and private men, are much more obnoxious to error in ſuch Points; and in particular in this, that *Scripture alone is Judge of Controverſies*: And ſo, the very Principle upon which

q In his Defence of Mr. *Hookers* books *art.* 4. *p.* 31.

which their whole Faith is grounded, remains to them uncertain: and on the other ſide, for the ſelf-ſame ſeaſon, they are not certain, but that the Church is Judge of Controverſies; which if ſhe be, then their caſe is lamentable, who in *general* deny her this Authority, and in *particular* Controverſies oppoſe her definitions. Beſides, among publique Concluſions defended in *Oxford* the year 1633. to the queſtions, *Whether the Church have Authority to determine Controverſies in Faith*; And, *To interpret holy Scripture?* The anſwer to both is *Affirmative*.

27. Since then, the viſible Church of Chriſt our Lord, is that infallible *Means whereby the revealed truths of Almighty God, are conveyed to our underſtanding*; it followeth, that to oppoſe her definitions is to reſiſt God himſelf; which bleſſed St. *Auguſtine* plainly affirmeth, when, ſpeaking of the Controverſie about *Rebaptization* of ſuch as were baptized by Heretiques, he ſaith, *This* (r) *is neither openly, nor evidently read; neither by you nor by me: yet if there were any wiſe man of whom our Saviour had given teſtimony, and that he ſhould be conſulted in this queſtion, we ſhould make no doubt to perform what he ſhould ſay, leſt we might ſeem to gain-ſay not him ſo much as Chriſt, by whoſe teſtimony he was recommended. Now Chriſt beareth witneſs to his Church.* And a little after, *Whoſoever refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church, doth reſiſt our Saviour himſelf, who by his teſtimony recommends the Church.* I conclude therefore with this argument; Whoſoever reſiſteth that means which infallibly propoſeth to us God's Word or Revelation, commits a ſin, which, unrepented, excludes Salvation: But whoſoever reſiſteth Chriſt's viſible Church, doth reſiſt that means, which infallibly propoſeth God's Word or Revelation to us. Therefore, whoſoever reſiſteth Chriſt's viſible Church, commits a ſin, which unrepented, excludes Salvation. Now, what viſible Church was extant, when *Luther* began his pretended Reformation, whether it were the *Roman*, or *Proteſtant* Church; and whether he, and other Proteſtants do not oppoſe that viſible Church, which was ſpread over the World, before, and in *Luther*'s time, is eaſie to be determined, and importeth every one moſt ſeriouſly to ponder, as a thing whereon eternal ſalvation dependeth. And becauſe our Adverſaries do here moſt inſiſt upon the diſtinction of Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental; and in particular teach, that the Church may erre in Points not-Fundamental, it will be neceſſary to examine the truth, and weight of this evaſion, which ſhall be done in the next Chapter.

r *De unit. Eccleſ. c.* 22.

An ANSWER to the SECOND CHAPTER.

Concerning the means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our Underſtanding; and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.

AD §. 1. He that would uſurp an abſolute Lordſhip and tyranny over any people, need not put himſelf to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and diſanulling the Laws, made to maintain the common liberty; for he may fruſtrate their intent, and compaſs his own deſign as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleaſes, and add to them what he pleaſes, and to have his interpretations and additions ſtand for Laws; if he can rule his people by his Laws, and his Laws by his Lawyers. So the *Church of Rome*, to eſtabliſh her tyranny over mens conſciences, needed not either to aboliſh or corrupt the holy Scriptures, the Pillars and ſupporters of Chriſtian liberty (which in regard of the numerous multitude of Copies diſperſed through all places, tranſlated into almoſt all Languages, guarded with all ſollicitous care and induſtry, had been an impoſſible attempt:) But the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be ſucceſſeful, was, to gain the opinion and eſteem of the *publique and authoriz'd Interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what Doctrin ſhe pleaſed under the title of *Traditions* or *Definitions*. For by this means, ſhe might both ſerve her ſelf of all thoſe clauſes of Scripture, which might be drawn to caſt a favourable countenance upon her ambitious pretences, which in caſe the Scripture had been aboliſhed, ſhe could not have done; and yet be ſecure enough of having either her power limited, or her corruptions and abuſes reformed by them; this being once ſetled in the minds

of

of men, that *unwritten doctrins, if proposed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to those that were writen*; and that *the sense of Scripture was not that which seemed to mens reason and understanding to be so, but that which the Church of* Rome *should declare to be so, seemed it never so unreasonable and incongruous*. The matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your Directors and Judges (no farther than you please) but your *servants and instruments*, alwayes prest and in readiness to advance your designes, and disabled wholly with minds so qualified to prejudice or impeach them; it is safe for you to put a crown on their head, and a reed in their hands, and to bow before them, and cry, *Hail King of the Jews*! to pretend a great deal of *esteem, and respect, and reverence* to them, as here you do. But to little purpose is verbal reverence without entire submission and syncere obedience; and, as our Saviour said of some, so the Scripture, could it speak, I believe would say to you, *Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not that which I command you?* Cast away the vain and arrogant pretence of *infallibility*, which makes your errors incurable. Leave picturing God, and worshipping him by pictures. *Teach not for Doctrin the commandements of men.* Debarr not the Laity of the Testament of Christ's Blood. Let your publique Prayers, and Psalms, and Hymns be in such language as is for the edification of the Assistents. Take not from the Clergy that liberty of Marriage which Christ hath left them. Do not impose upon men that *Humility of worshipping Angels* which S. *Paul* condemns. Teach no more proper sacrifices of Christ but one. Acknowledg them *that die in Christ to be blessed, and to rest from their labours*. Acknowledge the Sacrament after Consecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Christs body and bloud. Acknowledg the gift of continency without Marriage, not to be given to all. Let not the weapons of your warfare be carnal, such as Massacres, Treasons, Persecutions, and, in a word, all means either violent or fraudulent: These and other things, which the Scripture commands you, do, and then we shall willingly give you such Testimony as you deserve; but till you do so, to talk of *estimation, respect, and reverence to the Scripture*, is nothing else but talk.

2. For neither is that true which you pretend, *That we possess the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your Custody*; but upon *Universal Tradition*, of which you are but a little part. Neither, if it were true that Protestants acknowledged, *The integrity of it to have been guarded by your alone Custody*, were this any argument of your reverence towards them. For first, you might preserve them entire, not for want of Will, but of Power to corrupt them, *as it is a hard thing to poyson the Sea*. And then having prevailed so farr with men, as either not to look at all into them, or but only through such spectacles as you should please to make for them, and to see nothing in them, though as cleer as the sun, if it any way made against you, you might keep them entire, without any thought or care to conform your doctrin to them, or reform it by them (which were indeed to reverence the Scriptures;) but, out of a perswasion, that you could qualify them well enough with your glosses and interpretations, and make them sufficiently conformable to your present Doctrin, at least in their judgement, who were prepossessed with this perswasion, that *your Church was to Judge of the sense of Scripture, not to be judged by it*.

3. For

3. For, whereas you ſay, *No cauſe imaginable could avert your will, for giving the function of ſupreme and ſole Judge to holy Writ; but that the thing is impoſſible, and that by this means controverſies are increaſed and not ended:* you mean perhaps,——*That you can or will imagine no other cauſe but theſe.* But ſure there is little reaſon you ſhould meaſure other mens imaginations by your own, who perhaps may be ſo clouded and vailed with prejudice, that you cannot, or will not, ſee that which is moſt manifeſt. For what indifferent and unprejudicate man may not eaſily conceive another cauſe which (I do not ſay does, but certainly) may pervert your wills, and avert your underſtandings from ſubmitting your Religion and Church to a *tryall by Scripture?* I mean the great and apparent and unavoidable danger which by this means you would fall into, of loſing the Opinion which men have of your Infallibility, and conſequently your power and authority over mens conſciences, and all that depends upon it. So that though *Diana of the Epheſians* be cryed up, yet it may be feared that with a great many among you (though I cenſure or judge no man) the other cauſe which wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen*, may have with you alſo the more effectual, though more ſecret influence: and that is, that *by this craft we have our living*; by this craft, I mean, of keeping your Proſelytes from an indifferent tryal of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yield up and captivate their judgement unto yours. Yet had you only ſaid *de facto*, that no other cauſe did avert your own will from this, but only theſe which you pretend; out of Charity I ſhould have believed you. But ſeeing you ſpeak not of your ſelf, but of all of your Side, whoſe hearts you cannot know; and profeſs not only, That there is no other cauſe, but that *No other is imaginable*, I could not let this paſſe without a cenſure. As for the impoſſibility of Scriptures being the ſole Judge of Controverſies, that is, *the ſole Rule for men to judge them by* (for we mean nothing elſe) you only affirm it without proof, as if the thing were evident of it ſelf. And therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be more evident, might well content my ſelf to deny it without refutation. Yet I cannot but deſire you to tell me, If Scripture cannot be the Judge of any Controverſie, how ſhall that touching the *Church and the Notes of it*, be determined? And if it be the ſole Judge of this one, why may it not of others? Why not of All? Thoſe only excepted wherein the Scripture it ſelf is the ſubject of the Queſtion, which cannot be determined but by natural reaſon, the only principle, beſide Scripture, which is common to Chriſtians.

4. Then for the Imputation of *increaſing contentions and not ending them*, Scripture is innocent of it; as alſo this opinion, *That controverſies are to be decided by Scripture*. For if men did really and ſincerely ſubmit their judgements to Scripture, and that only, and would require no more of any man but to do ſo, it were impoſſible but that all Controverſies, touching things neceſſary and very profitable ſhould be ended: and if others were continued or increaſed, it were no matter.

5. In the next words we have direct *Boyes-play*; a thing given with one hand, and taken away with the other; an acknowledgment made in one line, and retracted in the next. *We acknowledg* (ſay you) *Scripture to be a perfect rule, for as much as a Writing can be a Rule; only we deny that it excludes unwritten Tradition.* As if you ſhould have ſaid, We acknowledg it to be as perfect a Rule as a Writing can be; only we deny it to be as perfect a Rule

as

as a writing may be. Either therefore you must revoke your acknowledgment, or retract your retractation of it; for both cannot possibly stand together. For if you will stand to what you have granted, That *Scripture is as perfect a Rule of Faith as a writing can be*: you must then grant it both so *Compleat*, that it needs no addition, and so *evident*, that it needs no interpretation: For both these properties are requisite to a *perfect Rule*, and a writing is capable of both these properties.

6. That both these properties are requisite to a *perfect Rule*, it is apparent: Because that is not perfect in any kind which wants some parts belonging to its integrity; As, he is not a perfect man that wants any part appertaining to the Integrity of a Man; and therefore that which wants any accession to make it a perfect Rule, of it self is not a perfect Rule. And then, the end of a *Rule* is to regulate and direct. Now every instrument is more or lesse perfect in its kind, as it is more or lesse fit to attain the end for which it is ordained: But nothing obscure or unevident while it is so, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is so: Therefore it is requisite also to a *Rule* (so farr as it is a Rule) to be evident; otherwise indeed it is no *Rule*, because it cannot serve for direction. I conclude therefore, that both these properties are required to a perfect Rule: both to be so compleat as to need no Addition; and to be so evident as to need no Interpretation.

7. Now that a writing is capable of both these perfections, it is so plain, that I am even ashamed to prove it. For he that denies it, must say, That *something may be spoken which cannot be written*. For if such a compleat and evident Rule of Faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatsoever is delivered by word of mouth may also be written; then such a compleat and evident Rule of Faith may also be written. If you will have more light added to the Sun, answer me then to these Questions. Whether your Church can set down in writting all these, which she pretends to be divine unwritten Traditions, and add them to the verities already written? And, Whether she can set us down such interpretations of all obscurities in the Faith as shall need no farther interpretations? If she cannot, then she hath not that power which you pretend she hath, of being an *Infallible Teacher of all divine verities*, and an infallible Interpreter of obscurities in the Faith: for she cannot teach us all divine verities, if she cannot write them down; neither is that an interpretation which needs again to be interpreted. If she can; Let her do it, and then we shall have a writting, not only capable of, but, actually endowed with, both these perfections, of being both so compleat as to need no Addition, and so evident as to need no Interpretation. Lastly, whatsoever your Church can do or not do, no man can, without Blasphemy, deny, that *Christ Jesus*, if he had pleased, could have writ us a Rule of Faith so plain and perfect, as that it should have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any cleerness to make it sufficiently intelligible. And if Christ could have done this, then the thing might have been done; a writting there might have been, indowed with both these properties. Thus therefore I conclude; a writing may be so perfect a Rule, as to need neither Addition nor Interpretation; But the *Scripture you acknowledg a perfect Rule for as much as a writing can be a Rule*, therefore it needs neither Addition nor Interpretation.

8. You

8. You will ſay, that *though a writing be never ſo perfect a Rule of Faith, yet it muſt be beholding to Tradition to give it this Teſtimony, that it is a Rule of Faith, and the Word of God.* I anſwer: Firſt, there is no abſolute neceſſity of this. For God might, if he thought good, give it the atteſtation of perpetua'l miracles. Secondly, that it is one thing to be a perfect Rule of Faith, another to be proved ſo unto us. And thus though a writing could not be proved to us to be a perfect rule of Faith, by its owne ſaying ſo, for nothing is proved true by being ſaid or written in a book, but only by Tradition which is a thing credible of it ſelf: yet it may be ſo in it ſelf, and contain all the material objects, all the particular articles of our Faith, without any dependance upon Tradition; even this alſo not excepted, that *this writing doth contain the rule of Faith.* Now when Proteſtants affirm againſt Papiſts, that *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith*, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things abſolutely may be proved, which are to be believed: For it can never be proved by Scripture to a gainſayer, that there is a God, or that the book called Scripture is the word of God; For he that will deny theſe Aſſertions when they are ſpoken, will believe them never a whit the more, becauſe you can ſhew them written: But their meaning is, that the Scripture to them which preſuppoſe it Divine, and a Rule of Faith, as Papiſts and Proteſtants do, contains all the material objects of Faith, is a compleat and total, and not onely an imperfect and a partial Rule.

9. *But every Book, and Chapter, and Text of Scripture is infallible and wants no due perfection, and yet excludes not the Addition of other books of Scripture; Therefore the perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I anſwer; Every Text of Scripture though it hath the perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the perfection requiſite to a *perfect Rule of Faith*; and that only is the perfection which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe. So that this is to abuſe your Reader with the ambiguity of the word *Perfect*. In effect, as if you ſhould ſay, A text of Scripture may be a perfect Text, though there be others beſide it; therefore the whole Scripture may be a perfect Rule of Faith, though there be other parts of this Rule, beſides the Scripture, and though the Scripture be but a part of it.

10. The next Argument to the ſame purpoſe is, for Sophiſtry, coſen-german to the former. *When the firſt books of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritten Tradition: Therefore now alſo, that all the books of Scripture are written, Traditions are not excluded.* The ſenſe of which argument (if it have any) muſt be this. When only a part of the Scripture was written, then a part of the divine doctrine was unwritten; Therefore now when all the Scripture is written, yet ſome part of the divine doctrine is yet unwritten. If you ſay, your Concluſion is not, that it is ſo, but, without diſparagement to Scripture, may be ſo: without diſparagement to the truth of Scripture, I grant it; but without diſparagement to the Scripture's being a *perfect Rule*, I deny it. And now the Queſtion is not of the Truth, but the perfection of it; which are very different things, though you would fain confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it contain not all neceſſary Divine Truth. But unleſſe it do ſo, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For, I hope, you do not imagine, that we conceive any antipathy between

between God's Word written and unwritten, but that both might very well ſtand together. All that we ſay is this, that we have reaſon to believe that God, *de facto*, hath ordered the matter ſo, that all the Goſpel of Chriſt, the whole Covenant between God and man, is now written. Whereas, if he had pleaſed, he might ſo have diſpoſed it, that, part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we ſhould have had recourſe, for that part of it which was not written; which ſeeing he hath not done (as the progreſſe ſhall demonſtrate) it is evident he hath left no part of it unwritten. We know no man therefore that ſayes, It were any injury to the written Word to be joyned with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joyned: but that, we deny. The fidelity of a keeper may very well conſiſt with the authority of the thing committed to his cuſtody. But we know no one ſociety of Chriſtians that is ſuch a faithfull keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it ſelf was not kept ſo faithfully by you, but that you ſuffered infinite variety of Readings to creep into it; all which could not poſſibly be divine, and yet, in ſeveral parts of your Church, all of them, until the laſt Age, were ſo eſteemed. The interpretations of obſcure places of Scripture, which without Queſtion the Apoſtles taught the Primitive Chriſtians, are wholly loſt; there remains no certainty ſcarce of any one. Thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were not written, for want of writing are vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And many profitable things which the Apoſtles taught and writ not, as that which S. *Paul* glanceth at in his *ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſal.* of the *cauſe of the hinderance of the coming of Antichriſt*, are wholly loſt and extinguiſhed. So unfaithful or negligent hath been this Keeper of Divine Verities; whoſe eyes, like the Keepers of *Iſrael* (you ſay) have *never ſlumbred nor ſlept*. Laſtly, we deny not but a Judge and a Law might well ſtand together, but we deny that there is any ſuch Judge of Gods appointment. Had he intended any ſuch Judge, he would have named him, leſt otherwiſe (as now it is) our *Judge of Controverſies* ſhould be our greateſt Controverſie.

11. *Ad §. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.* In your ſecond Paragraph, you ſum up thoſe Arguments wherewith you intend to prove that *Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies*. Wherein I profeſs unto you before hand, that you will fight without an Adverſary. For though Proteſtants, being warranted by ſome of the Fathers, have called Scripture the *Judge of Controverſie*; and you, in ſaying here, That Scripture *alone* cannot be Judge, imply that it may be called in ſome ſenſe a Judge, though not alone: Yet, to ſpeak properly (as men ſhould ſpeak when they write of Controverſies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Judge of Controverſies, but *a Rule only, and the only Rule for Chriſtians to judge them by*. Every man is to judge for himſelf with the *Judgement of Diſcretion*, and to chooſe either his Religion firſt, and then his Church, as we ſay: or, as you, his Church firſt, and then his Religion. But, by the conſent of both ſides, every man is to judge and chooſe: and the Rule whereby he is to guide his choice, if he be a natural man, is Reaſon; if he be already a Chriſtian, Scripture; which we ſay is the Rule to judge Controverſies by. Yet not all ſimply, but all the Controverſies of Chriſtians, of thoſe that are already agreed upon This firſt Principle, that *the Scripture is the Word of God*. But that there is any

Man,

Man, or any Company of men appointed to be Judge for all men, that we deny; and that I believe, you will never prove. The very truth is, we ſay no more in this matter, than evidence of Truth hath made you confeſs in plain terms in the beginning of this Chapter, *viz.* That *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith, for as much as a writing can be a Rule.* So that all your Reaſons, whereby you labour to dethrone the Scripture from this Office of *Judging*, we might let paſs as impertinent to the Concluſion which we maintain, and you have already granted; yet out of courteſie we will conſider them.

12. Your firſt is this; *A Judge muſt be a perſon fit to end Controverſies; but the Scripture is not a perſon, nor fit to end Controverſies, no more than the Law would be without the Judges; therefore though it may be a Rule, it cannot be a Judge.* Which concluſion I have already granted. Only my requeſt is, that you will permit Scripture to have the properties of a Rule, that is, to be fit to direct every one that will make the beſt uſe of it, to that end for which it was ordained: And that is as much as we need deſire. For, as if I were to go a journey, and had a guide which could not err, I needed not to know my way: ſo on the other ſide, if I know my way, or have a plain rule to know it by, I ſhall need no guide. Grant therefore Scripture to be ſuch a Rule, and it will quickly take away all neceſſity of having an infallible guide. But *without a living Judge it will be no fitter* (you ſay) *to end Controverſies, than the Law alone to end ſuits.* I anſwer, if the Law were plain and perfect, and men honeſt and deſirous to underſtand aright, and obey it, he that ſays it were not fit to end Controverſies, muſt either want underſtanding himſelf, or think the world wants it. Now *the Scripture*, we pretend, *in things neceſſary is plain and perfect*; and men, we ſay, are obliged under pain of Damnation, to ſeek the true ſenſe of it, and not to wreſt it to their preconceived Fancies. Such a law therefore to ſuch men, cannot but be very fit to end all Controverſies neceſſary to be ended. For others that are not ſo, they will end when the world ends, and that is time enough.

13. Your next encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Judge, make the holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, the Judge of Controverſies. Which you diſprove by ſaying, *That, the holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he ſpeaks.* But by this reaſon, neither the Pope, nor a Councel can be a Judge neither. For firſt, denying the Scriptures, the writings of the holy Ghoſt, to be Judges; you will not, I hope, offer to pretend, that their Decrees, the writings of men, are more capable of this function: the ſame exceptions at leaſt, if not more, and greater lying againſt them as do againſt Scripture. And then what you object againſt the holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this office, The ſame I return upon them and their Decrees, to debar them from it; that they ſpeaking unto us only in their Decrees, are no more intelligible than the Decrees in which they ſpeak. And therefore if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in Scripture may not be a Judge for this Reaſon; neither may they, ſpeaking in their Decrees, be Judges for the ſame Reaſon. *If the Pope's Decrees* (you will ſay) *be obſcure, he can explain himſelf; and ſo the Scripture cannot.* But the holy Ghoſt, that ſpeaks in Scripture, can do ſo, if he pleaſe; and, when he is pleaſed, will do ſo. In the mean time, it will be fit for you to wait his leiſure, and to be content, that thoſe things of Scripture

which are plain ſhould be ſo, and thoſe which are obſcure ſhould remain obſcure, until he pleaſe to declare them. Beſides, he can (which you cannot warrant me of the Pope or a Councel) ſpeak at firſt ſo plainly, that his words ſhall need no farther explanation; and ſo in things neceſſary we believe he hath done. And if you ſay, *The Decrees of Councels touching Controverſies, though they be not the Judge, yet they are the Judge's ſentence:* So, I ſay, the Scripture, though not the Judge, is the ſentence of the Judge. When therefore you conclude, *That, to ſay a Judge is neceſſary for deciding Controverſies about the meaning of Scripture, is as much as to ſay, He is neceſſary to decide what the holy Ghoſt ſpeaks in Scripture*: This, I grant, is true; but I may not grant that a Judge (ſuch an one as we diſpute of) is neceſſary either to do the one, or the other. For, if the Scripture (as it is in things neceſſary) be plain, why ſhould it be more neceſſary to have a Judg to interpret them in plain places, than to have a Judg to interpret the meaning of a Councel's Decrees, and others to interpret their Interpretations, & others to interpret theirs, and ſo on for ever? And where they are not plain, there if we, uſing diligence to find the Truth, do yet miſs of it and fall into Errour, there is no danger in it. They that err, and they that do not err, may both be ſaved. So that thoſe places, which contain things neceſſary, and wherein Errour were dangerous, need no infallible interpreter, becauſe they are plain: and thoſe that are obſcure need none, becauſe they contain not things Neceſſary, neither is Errour in them dangerous.

13. *The Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law*, I grant it, *is no more eaſily underſtood than the Law it ſelf*; for his ſpeech is nothing elſe but the Law: I grant it *very neceſſary, that, beſides the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, there ſhould be other Judges to determine Civil and Criminal Controverſies, and to give every man that juſtice which the Law allows him.* But your Argument drawn from hence to ſhew a neceſſity of a Viſible Judge in Controverſies of Religion, I ſay is Sophiſtical: and that for many Reaſons.

14. Firſt, Becauſe the variety of Civil caſes is infinite, and therefore there cannot be poſſibly Laws enough provided for the determination of them: and therefore there muſt be a Judge to ſupply out of the Principles of Reaſon the interpretation of the Law where it is defective. But the Scripture (we ſay) is a perfect Rule of Faith, and therefore needs no ſupply of the defects of it.

15. Secondly, To execute the Letter of the Law, according to rigor, would be many times unjuſt, and therefore there is need of a Judge to moderate it; whereof in Religion there is no uſe at all.

16. Thirdly, In Civil and Criminal Cauſes the parties have for the moſt part ſo much intereſt, and very often ſo little honeſty, that they will not ſubmit to a Law though never ſo plain, if it be againſt them; or will not ſee it to be againſt them, though it be ſo never ſo plainly: whereas if men were honeſt, and the Law were plain and extended to all caſes, there would be little need of Judges. Now in matters of Religion, when the Queſtion is, Whether every man be a fit Judge and chooſer for himſelf, we ſuppoſe men honeſt, and ſuch as underſtand the difference between a Moment and Eternity. And ſuch men we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion ſhould be the true. And then we ſuppoſe that all the neceſſary points of Religion are plain and eaſie, and conſequently every man in this cauſe

to

to be a competent Judge for himself; because it concerns himself to judge right as much as eternal happiness is worth. And if, through his own default he judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.

17. Fourthly, In Civil Controversies we are obliged only to external passive obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the sentence of the Judge, or not to resist it, but not always to believe it just. But, in matters of Religion, such a Judge is required whom we should be obliged to believe, to have jndged right. So that in Civil Controversies every honest understanding man is fit to be a Judge; But in Religion none but he that is infallible.

18. Fifthly, In Civil Causes there is means and power, when the Judge hath decreed, to compell men to obey his sentence: otherwise, I believe, Laws alone, would be to as much purpose for the ending of differences, as Laws and Judges both. But all the power in the world is neither fit to convince, nor able to compell a man's conscience to consent to any thing. Worldly terrour may prevail so far as to make men profess a Religion which they believe not, (such men I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for those that dissemble such Truths as are necessary to be professed): But to force, either any man to believe what he believes not, or any honest man to dissemble what he does believe (if God commands him to profess it,) or to profess what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell to assist them.

19. Sixthly, In Civil Controversies the case cannot be so put, but there may be Judge to end it, who is not a party: In Controversies of Religion, it is in a manner impossible to be avoided, but the Judge must be a party. For this must be the first, Whether he be a Judge or no, and in that he must be a party. Sure I am, the Pope, in the Controversies of our time, is a chief party; for it highly concerns him, even as much as his Popedom is worth, not to yield any one point of his Religion to be erroneous. And he is a man subject to like passions with other men. And therefore we may justly decline his sentence, for fear temporal respects should either blind his judgement, or make him pronounce against it.

20. Seventhly, In Civil Controversies, it is impossible *Titius* should hold the land in question and *Sempronius* too: and therefore either the Plaintiff must injure the Defendant by disquieting his possession, or the Defendant wrong the Plaintiff by keeping his right from him. But in Controversies of Religion, the Case is otherwise. I may hold my opinion and do you no wrong, and you yours and do me none. Nay, we may both of us hold our opinion, and yet do our selves no harm; provided, the difference be not touching any thing necessary to salvation, and that we love truth so well, as to be diligent to inform our Conscience, & constant in following it.

21. Eighthly, For the deciding of Civil Controversies, men may appoint themselves a Judge. But, in matters of Religion, this office may be given to none but whom God hath designed for it: who doth not always give us those things which we conceive most expedient for our selves.

22. Ninthly, and Lastly, For the ending of Civil Controversies, Who does not see, it is absolutely necessary, that not only Judges should be appointed, but that it should be known and unquestioned who they are? Thus all the Judges of our Land are known men, known to be Judges, and no man

can doubt or queſtion, but theſe are the Men. Otherwiſe, if it were a diſputable thing, Who were theſe Judges, and they had no certain warrant for their Authority, but only ſome Topical congruities; Would not any man ſay, ſuch Judges, in all likelihood, would rather multiply Controverſies, than end them? So likewiſe, if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be by ſome viſible Judge finally determined, Who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expreſſed himſelf about this matter? He would have ſaid plainly, *The Biſhop of Rome I have appointed to decide all emergent Controverſies.* For that our Saviour deſigned the *Biſhop of Rome* to this Office, and yet would not ſay ſo, nor cauſe it to be written —— *ad Rei memoriam* —— by any of the *Evangeliſts* or *Apoſtles*, ſo much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain Conſequences, He that can believe it, let him.

23. All theſe Reaſons, I hope, will convince you, that though we have, and have great neceſſity of, Judges in Civil and Criminal Cauſes: yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publique authorized Judge to determine Controverſies in Religion, nor any neceſſity there ſhould be any.

24. *But the Scripture ſtands in need of ſome watchful and unerring eye to guard it, by means of whoſe aſſured Vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receive it ſincere and pure.* Very true, but this is no other than the watchful eye of Divine Providence: the goodneſs whereof will never ſuffer, that the Scripture ſhould be depraved and corrupted, but that in them ſhould be always extant a conſpicuous and plain way to eternal happineſs. Neither can any thing be more palpably unconſiſtent with his goodneſs, than to ſuffer Scripture to be undiſcernably corrupted in any matter of moment, and yet to exact of men the Belief of thoſe verities, which, without their fault, or knowledge, or poſſibility of prevention, were defaced out of them. So that God requiring of men to believe Scripture in its purity, ingages himſelf to ſee it preſerved in ſufficient purity; and you need not fear but he will ſatisfie his engagement. You ſay, *We can have no aſſurance of this, but your Churches Vigilancy.* But if we had no other, we were in a hard caſe; for, Who could then aſſure us that your Church hath been ſo vigilant, as to guard Scripture from any the leaſt alteration? There being various Lections in the ancient Copies of your Bibles, What ſecurity can your new raiſed *Office of Aſſurance* give us, that that reading is true which you now receive, and that falſe which you reject? Certainly, they that anciently received and made uſe of thoſe divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Churches Vigilancy from having their Scripture altered from the purity of the Original in many places. For of different readings, it is not in nature impoſſible that all ſhould be falſe, but more than one cannot poſſibly be true. Yet the want of ſuch a protection, was no hinderance to their ſalvation, and Why then ſhall the having of it be neceſſary for ours? But then, this Vigilancy of your Church, what means have we to be aſcertained of it? Firſt, the thing is not evident of it ſelf; which is evident, becauſe many do not believe it. Neither can any thing be pretended to give evidence to it, but only ſome places of Scripture; of whoſe incorruption more than any other, what is it that can ſecure me? If you ſay the Churches Vigilancy, you are in a Circle, proving the Scriptures uncor-

uncorrupted by the Churche's Vigilancy, and the Churche's Vigilancy by the incorruption of ſome places of Scripture, and again the incorruption of thoſe places by the Churche's Vigilancy. If you name any other means; then, that means which ſecures me of the Scripture's incorruption in thoſe places, will alſo ſerve to aſſure me of the ſame in other places. For my part, abſtracting from Divine Providence, which will never ſuffer the way to Heaven to be blocked up, or made inviſible, I know no other means (I mean, no other natural and rational means) to be aſſured hereof, than I have that any other Book is uncorrupted. For, though I have a greater degree of rational and humane Aſſurance of that than this, in regard of divers conſiderations which make it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preſerved from any material alteration*; yet my Aſſurance of both is of the ſame kind and condition; both Moral Aſſurances, and neither Phyſical or Mathematical.

25. To the next Argument the Reply is obvious; *That, though we do not believe the Books of Scripture to be Canonical, becauſe they ſay ſo*, (For other Books that are not Canonical may ſay they are, and thoſe that are ſo, may ſay nothing of it): yet we believe not this upon the Authority of your Church, but upon the Credibility of *Univerſal Tradition*, which is a thing *Credible of it ſelf*, and therefore fit to be reſted on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not ſo. And therefore your reſt thereon is not Rational but meerly voluntary. I might as well reſt upon the judgement of the next man I meet, or upon the chance of a Lottery for it. For by this means I only know I might err, but by replying on you I know I ſhould err. But yet (to return you one Suppoſe for another) ſuppoſe I ſhould for this and all other things ſubmit to her direction, How could ſhe aſſure me that I ſhould not be miſled by doing ſo? She pretends indeed infallibility herein, but how can ſhe aſſure us that ſhe hath it? What, by Scripture? That, you ſay, cannot aſſure us of its own Infallibility, and therefore not of yours. What then, by Reaſon? That, you ſay, may deceive in other things, and why not in this? How then will ſhe aſſure us hereof, By ſaying ſo? Of this very affirmation there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill, How can it prove it ſelf to be infallibly true? Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, till we reſt in ſomething evident of it ſelf, which demonſtrates to the world that this Church is infallible. And ſeeing there is no ſuch Rock for the Infallibility of this Church to be ſetled on, it muſt of neceſſity, like the Iland of *Delos*, flote up and down for ever. And yet upon this Point according to Papiſts, all other Controverſies in faith depend.

26. *To the* 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. *Q.* The ſum and ſubſtance of the Ten next Paragraphs, is this, *That it appears, by the Confeſſion of ſome Proteſtants, and the Contentions of others, that the Queſtions about the Canon of Scripture, what it is; and about the Various Reading and Tranſlations of it, which is true, and which not; are not to be determined by Scripture, and therefore that all Controverſies of Religion are not decidable by Scripture.*

27. To which I have already anſwered, ſaying, That, when Scripture is affirmed to be the Rule by which all Controverſies of Religion are to be decided, Thoſe are to be excepted out of this generality, which are concerning the Scripture it ſelf. For, as that general ſaying of Scripture, *He hath put all things under his feet*, is moſt true, though yet S. *Paul* tell us, *That*

when it is ſaid, He hath put all things under him, it is manifeſt he is excepted who did put all things under him: So when we ſay that all Controverſies of Religion are decidable by the Scripture, it is manifeſt to all, but cavillers, that we do, and muſt, except from this generality, thoſe which are *touching the Scripture it ſelf.* Juſt as a Merchant ſhewing a Ship of his own, may ſay, All my ſubſtance is in this Ship; and yet never intend to deny, that his Ship is part of his ſubſtance, nor yet to ſay that his Ship is in it ſelf. Or, as a man may ſay, that a whole houſe is ſupported by the foundation, and yet never mean to exclude the foundation from being a part of the houſe, or to ſay; that it is ſupported by it ſelf. Or as you your ſelves uſe to ſay, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Head of the whole Church, and yet would think us but captious Sophiſters, ſhould we infer from hence, that either you made him no part of the whole, or elſe made him head of himſelf. Your Negative Concluſion, therefore, that theſe *Queſtions touching Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture,* you needed not have cited any Authorities, nor urged any Reaſon to prove it; it is evident of it ſelf, and I grant it without more ado. But your corollary from it, which you would inſinuate to your unwary Reader, *That therefore they are to be decided by your, or any, Viſible Church,* is a meer inconſequence, and very like his collection, who, becauſe *Pamphilus* was not to have *Glycerium* for his Wife, preſently concluded that he muſt have her; as if there had been no more men in the World but *Pamphilus* and himſelf. For ſo you, as if there were nothing in the World capable of this Office, but the Scripture, or the preſent Church; having concluded againſt Scripture, you conceive, but too haſtily, that you have concluded for the Church. But the truth is, neither the one nor the other have any thing to do with this matter. For firſt, the Queſtion *whether ſuch or ſuch a Book be Canonical Scripture,* though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by ſhewing apparent and irreconcileable contradictions between it and ſome other Book confeſſedly Canonical; yet affirmatively it cannot but only by the teſtimonies of the Ancient Churches: any Book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonical, or to be doubted of as Uncertain, or rejected as Apocryphal, according as it was received, or doubted of, or rejected by them. Then for the Queſtion, *Of various readings which is the true?* it is in reaſon evident, and confeſſed by your own Pope, that there is no poſſible determination of it, but only by compariſon with ancient Copies. And laſtly, for controverſies about different tranſlations of Scripture, the Learned have the ſame means to ſatisfie themſelves in it, as in the Queſtions which happen about the tranſlation of any other Author; that is, skill in the Language of the Original, and comparing tranſlations with it. In which way if there be no certainty, I would know what certainty you have, that your *Doway* old, and *Rhemiſh* new Teſtament, are true tranſlations? And then for the unlearned, thoſe on your ſide are ſubject to as much, nay the very ſame uncertainty with thoſe on ours. Neither is there any reaſon imaginable, why an ignorant Engliſh Proteſtant may not be as ſecure of of the Tranſlation of our Church, that it is free from errour, if not abſolutely, yet in matters of moment, as an ignorant Engliſh Papiſt can be of his *Rhemiſt* Teſtament, or *Doway* Bible. The beſt direction I can give them, is, to compare both together, and where there is no real difference (as in the Tranſlation of controverted places I believe there is very little) there

to

to be confident, that they are right; where they differ, there to be prudent in the choice of the Guides they follow. Which way of proceeding if it be ſubject to ſome poſſible errour, yet is it the beſt that either we, or you have; & it is not required that we uſe any better than the beſt we have.

28. You will ſay, *Dependance on your Churches infallibility is a better.* I anſwer, it would be ſo, if we could be infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, that is, if it were either evident of it ſelf, and ſeen by its own light, or could be reduced unto, and ſetled upon, ſome Principle that is ſo. But ſeeing you your ſelves do not ſo much as pretend to enforce us to the belief hereof, by any proofs infallible and convincing; but only to induce us to it, by ſuch as are, by your confeſſion, only probable and *prudential Motives*; certainly it will be to very little purpoſe, to put off your uncertainty for the firſt turn, and to fall upon it at the ſecond: to pleaſe your ſelves in building your houſe upon an imaginary Rock when you your ſelves ſee and confeſs, that this very Rock ſtands it ſelf at the beſt but upon a frame of timber. I anſwer ſecondly, that this cannot be a better way, becauſe we are infallibly certain that your Church is not infallible, and indeed hath not the real Preſcription of this Priviledge, but only pleaſeth her ſelf with a falſe imagination and vain preſumption of it; as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate by many unanſwerable Arguments.

29. Now ſeeing I make no ſcruple or difficulty to grant the concluſion of this Diſcourſe, that, *Theſe controverſies about Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*; and have ſhewed, that your deduction from it, that *therefore they are to be determined by the Authority of ſome preſent Church*, is irrational, and inconſequent; I might well forbear to tire my ſelf with an exact and punctual examination of your premiſes κατὰ πόδα, which whether they be true or falſe, is to the Queſtion diſputed wholly impertinent. Yet becauſe you ſhall not complain of tergiverſation, I will run over them, and let nothing, that is material and conſiderable, paſs without ſome ſtricture or animadverſion.

30. You pretend that M. *Hooker* acknowledgeth, that, *That whereon we muſt reſt our aſſurance that the Scripture is God's Word, is the Church:* and for this acknowledgement you referre us to *l.* 3. *ſ.* 8. Let the Reader conſult the place, and he ſhall find that he and M. *Hooker* have been much abuſed, both by you here, and by M. *Breerly*, and others before you; and that M. *Hooker* hath not one ſyllable to your pretended purpoſe, but very much directly to the contrary. There he tells us indeed, *That, ordinarily the firſt Introduction and probable Motive to the belief of the verity, is the Authority of the Church*; but, that it is the laſt Foundation whereon our belief hereof is rationally grounded, that in the ſame place he plainly denies. His words are, *Scripture teacheth us that ſaving Truth which God hath diſcovered unto the world by Revelation, and it preſumeth us taught otherwiſe, that it ſelf is Divine and Sacred. The Queſtion then being by what means we are taught this:* * ſome anſwer; *that to learn it we have no other way than Tradition. As, namely, that ſo we believe, becauſe we from our Predeceſſors, and they from theirs, have ſo received. But is this enough? That which all mens experience teacheth them, may not in any wiſe be denied: and by experience we all know, that* (a) *the firſt outward Motive leading men to eſteem of the Scripture, is, the Authority of God's Church. For when we know* (b) *the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge*

(* Some anſwer ſo, but he doth not.)

(a) The firſt outward Motive, not the laſt aſſurance whereon we reſt.

(b) The whole Church that he ſpeaks of, ſeems to be that particular Church, wherein a man is bred and brought up; and the Authority of this he makes an Argument which preſſeth a man's modeſty more than his reaſon. And in ſaying, It ſeems impudent to be of a contrary mind, without cauſe, he implies; There may be a juſt cauſe to be of a contrary mind, and that then it were no impudence to be ſo.

judge it at the first an impudent thing for any man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards, the more we bestow our labour upon reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, (c) *the more we find that the thing it self doth answer our received opinion concerning it: so that the former inducement, prevailing* (d) *somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministred farther reason. If Infidels or Atheists chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us occasion to sift what reason there is, whereby the testimony of the Church, concerning Scripture, and our own perswasion, which Scripture it self hath setled, may be proved a truth infallible.* (e) *In which case the ancient Fathers, being often constrained to shew what warrant they had so much to relie upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the Authority of the Books of God, by Arguments, such as the unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judge thereof as they should. Neither is it a thing impossible or greatly hard, even by such kind of proofs, so to manifest and clear that Point, that no man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent Principle, such as all men acknowledg to be true* (f). By this time, I hope, the Reader sees sufficient proof of what I said in my Reply to your Preface, that M. *Breerelie*'s great ostentation of exactness, is no very certain Argument of his fidelity.

31. But, *seeing the belief of Scripture is a necessary thing, and cannot be proved by Scripture, How can the Church of* England *teach, as she doth,* Art. 6. *That all things necessary are contained in Scripture?*

32. I have answered this already. And here again, I say, That all but cavillers will easily understand the meaning of the Article to be, That all the Divine verities, which Christ revealed to his Apostles, and the Apostles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture; That is, all the material objects of our Faith; whereof the Scripture is none, but only the means of conveying them unto us: which we believe not finally, and for it self, but for the matter contained in it. So that, if men did believe the Doctrine contained in Scripture, it should no way hinder their salvation, not to know whether there were any Scripture or no. Those barbarous Nations *Irenæus* speaks of, were in this case, and yet no doubt but they might be saved. The end that God aims at, is the belief of the Gospel, the Covenant between God and Man; the Scripture he hath provided as a means for this end, and this also we are to believe, but not as the last Object of our Faith, but as the Instrument of it. When therefore we subscribe to the *6 Art.* you must understand, that, by *Articles of Faith,* they mean the final and ultimate Objects of it, and not the Means and instrumental Objects; and then there will be no repugnance between what they say, and that which *Hooker,* and D. *Covel,* and D. *Whitaker,* and *Luther* here say.

33. But, *Protestants agree not in assigning the Canon of Holy Scripture.* Luther *and* Illyricus *reject the Epistle of S.* James: Kemnitius, *and other Lutherans, the second of* Peter, *the second and third of* John. *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of* James, *of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical.*

34. So also the *Ancient Fathers,* and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches,* differed about the certainty of the Authority of the very same Books: and by their difference shewed, they knew no necessity of conforming

(c) Therefore the Authority of the Church is not the pause whereon we rest: we had need of more assurance, and the intrinsecal Arguments afford it.

(d) Somewhat, but not much, until it be backed and inforced by farther reason: it self therefore is not the farthest reason and the last resolution.

(e) Observe, I pray; Our perswasion, and the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, may be proved true; Therefore neither of them was in his account the farthest proof.

(f) Natural reason then built on principles common to all men, is the last resolution; unto which the Churches Authority is but the first inducement.

forming themſelves herein to the judgement of your or any Church. For had they done ſo, they muſt have agreed all with that Church, and conſequently among themſelves. Now, I pray, tell me plainly, Had they ſufficient certainty what Scripture was Canonical, or had they not? If they had not, it ſeems there is no great harm or danger in not having ſuch a certainty whether ſome Books be Canonical or no, as you require: If they had, Why may not Proteſtants, notwithſtanding their differences, have ſufficient certainty hereof, as well as the Ancient Fathers and Churches, notwithſtanding theirs?

35. You proceed. And whereas the Proteſtants of *England* in the *6. Art.* have theſe words, *In the name of the Holy Scripture we do underſtand thoſe Books, of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; you demand, *What they mean by them? Whether that, by the Churches conſent they are aſſured what Scriptures be Canonical?* I anſwer for them. Yes, they are ſo. And whereas you inferre from hence, *This is to make the Church Judge*: I have told you already, That, *of this Controverſie we make the Church the Judge*; but not the preſent Church, much leſs the preſent Roman Church, but the conſent and teſtimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church*, Which, though it be but an highly probable inducement, and no demonſtrative enforcement; yet me-thinks you ſhould not deny but may be a ſufficient ground of Faith: Whoſe Faith, even of the Foundation of all your Faith, your Churches Authority is built laſtly and wholly upon *Prudential Motives*.

36. But, *by this Rule the whole Book of* Eſther *muſt quit the Canon; becauſe it was excluded by ſome in the Church*: by *Melito*, *Athanaſius*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*. Then, for ought I know, he that ſhould think he had reaſon to exclude it now, might be ſtill in the Church as well as *Melito*, *Athanaſius*, *Nazianzen* were. And while you thus inveigh againſt *Luther*, and charge him with Luciferian hereſies, for doing that which you in this very place confeſs, that Saints in Heaven before him have done, *are you not partial, and a Judge of evil thoughts?*

37. *Luther*'s cenſures of *Eccleſiaſtes*, *Job*, and the *Prophets*, though you make ſuch tragedies with them, I ſee none of them but is capable of a tolerable conſtruction, and far from having in them any fundamental Hereſie. He that condemns him for ſaying, the Book of *Eccleſiaſtes is not full, That it hath many abrupt things*, condemns him, for ought I can ſee, for ſpeaking truth. And the reſt of the cenſure is but a bold and blunt expreſſion of the ſame thing. The Book of *Job* may be a true Hiſtory, and yet, as many true ſtories are, and have been, an Argument of a Fable to ſet before us an example of Patience. And though the Books of the Prophets were not written by themſelves, but by their Diſciples, yet it does not follow that they were written caſually: (Though I hope, you will not damn all for Hereticks, that ſay, Some Books of Scripture were written caſually.) Neither is there any reaſon they ſhould the ſooner be called in queſtion for being written by their Diſciples, ſeeing being ſo written, they had atteſtation from themſelves. Was the Propheſie of *Jeremy* the leſs Canonical, for being written by *Baruch*? Or, becauſe *S. Peter* the Maſter, dictated the Goſpel, and *S. Mark* the Scholler writ it, is it the more likely to be called in Queſtion?

38. But leaving *Luther*, you return to our Engliſh Canon of Scripture;

ture; And tell us, That, *in the New Teſtament, by the above-mentioned Rule (of whoſe Authority was never doubt in the Church) divers Books muſt be diſ-canonized.* Not ſo. For I may believe even thoſe queſtioned Books to have been written by the Apoſtles, and to be Canonical: but I cannot in reaſon believe this of them ſo undoubtedly, as of *thoſe Books which were never queſtioned.* At leaſt I have no warrant to damn any man that ſhall doubt of them or deny them now: having the example of Saints in Heaven, either to juſtifie, or excuſe ſuch their doubting or denial.

39. You obſerve in the next place, That *our ſixth Article, ſpecifying by name all the Books of the Old Teſtament, ſhuffles over thoſe of the New with this generality——All the Books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical*: And in this you fancy to your ſelf *a myſterie of iniquity.* But if this be all the ſhuffling that the Church of *England* is guilty of, I believe the Church, as well as the King, may give for her Motto, *Honi ſoit qui mal y penſe.* For all the Bibles, which ſince the compoſing of the Articles have been uſed and allowed by the *Church of England*, do teſtifie and even proclaim to the World, that by *Commonly-received*, they meant, *received by the Church of* Rome, *and other Churches before the Reformation.* I pray, take the pains to look in them, and there you ſhall find the Books, which the Church of *England* counts Apocryphal, marked out, and ſevered from the reſt, with this Title in the beginning, *The Books called Apocrypha*; and with this cloſe or ſeal in the end, *The end of the Apocrypha.* And having told you by name, and, in particular, what Books only ſhe eſteems *Apocryphal*, I hope you will not put her to the trouble of telling you, that the reſt are in her judgment *Canonical.*

40. *But, if by* Commonly-received, *She meant, by the Church of* Rome; *then by the ſame reaſon, muſt ſhe receive divers Books of the Old Teſtament which ſhe rejects.*

41. Certainly, a very good conſequence. The Church of *England* receives the Books of the New Teſtament, which the Church of *Rome* receives; Therefore ſhe muſt receive the Books of the Old Teſtament which ſhe receives. As if you ſhould ſay, If you will do as we, in one thing, you muſt in all things. If you will pray to God with us, ye muſt pray to Saints with us. If you hold with us, when we have reaſon on our Side, you muſt do ſo, when we have no reaſon.

42. The Diſcourſe following, is but a vain Declamation. No man thinks that this Controverſie is to be tried by Moſt Voices, but by the Judgement and Teſtimony of the Ancient Fathers and Churches.

43. But, *with what Coherence can we ſay in the former part of the Article, That*, by Scripture we mean thoſe Books that were never doubted of; *and in the latter ſay*, We receive all the Books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, *whereas of them many were doubted?* I anſwer, When they ſay, *of whoſe Authority there was never any doubt in the Church*, They mean not, thoſe only of whoſe Authority there was ſimply no doubt at all, by any man in the Church; But ſuch as were not at any time doubted of by the whole Church, or by all Churches; but had atteſtation, though not univerſal, yet, at leaſt, ſufficient to make conſidering men receive them for Canonical. In which number they may well reckon thoſe Epiſtles which were ſometimes doubted of by ſome, yet whoſe num-

number and authority was not ſo great, as to prevail againſt the contrary ſuffrages.

44. But, *if to be* commonly received, *paſſe for a good Rule to know the Canon of the New Teſtament by, why not of the Old?* You conclude many times very well, but ſtill when you do ſo, it is out of Principles which no man grants: for, who ever told you, that to be *commonly received* is a good Rule to know the Canon of the New Teſtament by? Have you been trained up in Schools of ſubtilty, and cannot you ſee a great difference between theſe two, We receive the Books of the New Teſtament *as they are* commonly received, and we receive thoſe that are commonly received, *becauſe they are ſo?* To ſay this, were indeed to make, *being commonly received,* a Rule or reaſon to know the Canon by. But to ſay the former, doth no more make it a Rule then you ſhould make the Church of *England* the Rule of your receiving them, if you ſhould ſay, as you may, The Books of the New Teſtament we receive for Canonical, as they are received by the Church of *England.*

45. You demand, *Upon what infallible ground we agree with* Luther *againſt you in ſome, and with you againſt* Luther *in others?* And I alſo demand, Upon what infallible ground you hold your Canon, and agree neither with us, nor *Luther?* For ſure your differing from us both, is of it ſelfe no more apparently reaſonable, than our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther.* If you ſay, Your Churches infallibility is your ground: I demand again ſome infallible ground, both for the Churches infallibility, and for this, that *Yours is the Church*; and ſhall never ceaſe multiplying demands upon demands, until you ſettle me upon a Rock; I mean, give ſuch an Anſwer, whoſe Truth is ſo evident, that it needs no further evidence. If you ſay, *This is Univerſal Tradition:* I reply, your Churches infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receive it, is. For we do not profeſs our ſelves ſo abſolutely, and undoubtedly certain neither do we urge others to be ſo, of thoſe Books, which have been doubted, as of thoſe that never have.

46. The Concluſion of your Tenth § is, That *the Divinity of a writing cannot be known from it ſelf alone, but by ſome extrinſecal Authority*; Which you need not prove, for no wiſe man denies it. But then, this Authority is that of *Univerſal Tradition*, not of Your Church. For to me it is altogether as αὐτόπιστον, that the Goſpel of S. *Matthew* is the Word of God, as that all which your Church ſayes, is true.

That Believers of the Scriptnre, by conſidering the Divine matter, the excellent precepts, the glorious promiſes contained in it, may be confirmed in their faith of the Scriptures Divine Authority; and that among other inducements and enforcements hereunto, internal arguments have their place and force, certainly no man of underſtanding can deny. For my part I profeſſe, if the Doctrine of the Scripture were not as good, and as fit to come from the Fountain of goodneſs, as the Miracles by which it was confirmed, were great, I ſhould want one main Pillar of my faith: and for want of it, I fear, ſhould be much ſtagger'd in it. Now this and nothing elſe, did the *Doctor* mean in ſaying, *The Believer ſees, by that glorious Beam of Divine light which ſhines in Scriptnre, and by many internal Arguments, that the Scripture is of Divine Authority. By this* (ſaith he) *he ſees it*, that is, he is moved to, and ſtrengthened in, his beliefe of it: and by this partly, not wholly;

by

by this, not alone, but with the concurrence of other Arguments. He that will quarrel with him for saying so, must finde fault with the *Master of the Sentences*, and all his Schollers, for they all say the same. The rest of this Paragragh, I am as willing it should be true, as you are to have it: and so let it passe, as a discourse wherein we are wholly unconcerned. You might have met with an Answerer, that would not have suffered you to have said so much Truth together; but to me it is sufficient, that it is nothing to the purpose.

48. In the next Division, out of your liberality, you will suppose, that Scripture, like to a corporal light, is *by it self alone* able to determine and move our understanding to assent: yet notwithstanding this supposal, *Faith still* (you say) *must go before Scripture, because as the light is visible only to those that have eyes: so the Scripture, only to those that have the Eye of Faith.* But to my understanding, if Scripture do move and determine our Understanding to assent, then the Scripture, and its moving, must be before this assent, as the cause must be before its own effect; now this very assent is nothing else but Faith, and Faith nothing else than the Understanding's assent. And therefore (upon this supposal) Faith doth, and must, originally proceed from Scripture, as the effect from its proper cause: and the influence and efficacy of Scripture is to be presupposed before the assent of Faith, unto which it moves and determines, and consequently if this supposition of yours were true, there should need no other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, Scripture it self being able (as here you suppose) to determine and move the Understanding to assent, that is, to believe them, and the Verities contained in them. Neither is this to say, that the eyes with which we see, are made by the light by which we see. For you are mistaken much, if you conceive that in this comparison, Faith answers to the Eye. But if you will not pervert it, the Analogie must stand thus; Scripture must answer to light; The eye of the soul, that is, the Understanding, or the faculty of assenting, to the Bodily eye; And lastly, assenting or believing to the act of Seeing. As therefore the light, determining the Eye to see, though it presupposeth the Eye which it determines, as every Action doth the object on which it is imployed, yet it self is presuppos'd and antecedent to the act of seeing, as the cause is alwaies to its effect: So, if you will suppose that Scripture, like light, moves the Understanding to assent, the Understanding (that is the eye and object on which it workes) must be before this influence upon it; But the Assent, that is, the beliefe whereto the Scripture moves and the Under- is moved, which answers to the act of seeing, must come after. For if it did assent already, To what purpose should the Scripture do that which was done before? Nay indeed, How were it possible it should be so, any more than a Father can beget a Son that he hath already? Or an Architect built a house that is built already? Or than this very world can be made again before it be unmade? Transubstantiation indeed is fruitful of such Monsters. But they that have not sworn themselves to the defence of Error, will easily perceive, that *jam factum facere*, and *factum infectum facere*, are equally impossible. But I digress.

49. The close of this Paragraph, is a fit cover for such a dish. There you tell us, That *if there must be some other means precedent to Scripture to beget faith, this can be no other than the Church.* By the Church, we know you doe, and must understand the *Roman Church*: so that in effect you say,

no

no man can have faith, but he must be moved to it by your Churches Authority. And that is to say, that the King and all other Protestants, to whom you write, though they verily think they are Christians and believe the Gospel, because they assent to the truth of it, and would willingly die for it, yet indeed are Infidels and believe nothing. The Scripture tels us, *The heart of man knoweth no man, but the spirit of man which is in him.* And Who are you, to take upon you to make us believe, that we do not believe, what we know we do? But if I may think verily that I believe the Scripture, and yet not believe it; how know you that you believe the *Roman* Church? I am as verily and as strongly perswaded that I believe the Scripture, as you are that you believe the Church. And if I may be deceived, why may not you? Again, what more ridiculous, and against sense and experience, than to affirm, That there are not millions amongst you and us that believe, upon no other reason than their education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the opinion they have of them? The tenderness of the subject, and aptness to receive impressions, supplying the defect and imperfection of the Agent! And will you proscribe from heaven all those believers of your own Creed, who do indeed lay the foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other name) no deeper than upon the authority of their Father, or Master, or Parish-Priest? Certainly, if these have no true faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppose *Xaverius* by the holiness of his life had converted some Indians to Christianity, who could, (for so I will suppose) have no knowledge of your Church but from him, and therefore must last of all build their faith of the Church, upon their opinion of *Xaverius*: Do these remain as very Pagans after their conversion, as they were before? Are they brought to assent in their souls, and obey in their lives the Gospel of Christ, only to be Tantaliz'd and not saved, and not benefited, but deluded by it, because, forsooth, it is a man and not the Church that begets faith in them? What if their motive to believe be not in reason sufficient? Do they therefore not believe what they do believe, because they do it upon insufficient motives? They choose the Faith imprudently perhaps, but yet they do choose it. Unless you will have us believe, that that which is done, is not done, because it is not done upon good reason: which is to say, that never any man living ever did a foolish action. But yet I know not why the Authority of one holy man, which apparently hath no ends upon me, joyn'd with the goodness of the Christian faith, might not be a far greater and more rational motive to me to imbrace Christianity, than any I can have to continue in Paganism. And therefore, for shame, if not for love of Truth, you must recant this fancy when you write again: and suffer true faith to be many times, where your Churches infallibility hath no hand in the begetting of it. And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough, and not go about to perswade us we believe nothing, for fear with telling us what we know to be manifestly false, you should gain only this, *Not to be believed when you speak truth.* Some pretty sophisms you may haply bring us, to make us believe, we believe nothing: but wise men know that Reason against Experience is alwaies Sophistical. And therefore as he that could not answer *Zeno's* subtilties against the existence of Motion, could yet confute them by doing that, which he pretended could not be done: So, if you should give me a hundred Arguments to perswade me, because I do not believe Transubstan-

tiation, I do not believe in God, and the *Knots* of them I could not unty, yet I ſhould cut them in pieces with doing that, and knowing that I do ſo, which you pretend I cannot do.

50. In the thirteenth Diviſion, we have again much ado about nothing. A great deal of ſtir you keep in confuting ſome, *that pretend to know Canonical Scripture to be ſuch, by the Titles of the Books.* But theſe men you do not name, which makes me ſuſpect you cannot. Yet it is poſſible there may be ſome ſuch men in the world; for *Guſmen de Alfarache* hath taught us that, The Fools hoſpital is a large place.

51. In the fourteenth §. we have very artificial jugling. D. *Potter* had ſaid, *That the Scripture* (he deſires to be underſtood of thoſe books wherein all Chriſtians agree) *is a principle, and needs not be proved among Chriſtians.* His reaſon was, becauſe, *that needs no farther proof which is believed already.* Now by this (you ſay) he means either, that the Scripture is one of theſe firſt Principles, and moſt known in all Sciences, which cannot be proved: which is to ſuppoſe, it cannot be proved by the Church; and that is to ſuppoſe the Queſtion: Or, he means, That it is not the moſt known in Chriſtianity, and then it may be proved. Where we ſee plainly, That two moſt different things, *Moſt known in all Sciences*, and, *Moſt known in Chriſtianity*, are captiouſly confounded. As if the Scripture might not be the firſt and moſt known Principle in Chriſtianity, and yet not the moſt known in all Sciences? Or, as if to be a Firſt Principle *in Chriſtianity*, and *in all Sciences*, were all one? That Scripture is a Principle among Chriſtians, that is, ſo received by all that it need not be proved in any emergent Controverſie to any Chriſtian, but may be taken for granted, I think few will deny. You your ſelves are of this a ſufficient Teſtimony; for urging againſt us many texts of Scripture, you offer no proof of the truth of them, preſuming we will not queſtion it. Yet this is not to deny, that Tradition is a Principle more known than Scripture; But to ſay, It is a Principle not in Chriſtianity, but *in Reaſon*, nor proper to Chriſtians, but common to all men.

52. But, *It is repugnant to our practice to hold Scripture a Principle; becauſe we are wont to affirm, that one part of Scripture may be known to be Canonical, and may be interpreted by another.* Where the former device is again put in practice. For to be known to be *Canonical*, and to be *interpreted*, is not all one. That Scripture may be interpreted by Scripture, that Proteſtants grant, and Papiſts do not deny; neither does that any way hinder but that this aſſertion —— Scripture is the word of God, may be among Chriſtians a common Principle. But the firſt, -- That one part of Scripture may prove another part Canonical, and need no proof of its own being ſo; for that, you have produced divers Proteſtants that deny it; but who they are that affirm it, *nondum conſtat.*

53. It is ſuperfluous for you to prove *out of S.* Athanaſius, *and S.* Auſtine, *that we muſt receive the ſacred Canon, upon the credit of Gods Church.* Underſtanding by Church, as here you explain your ſelf, *The credit of Tradition.* And that not the Tradition of the Preſent Church, which we pretend may deviate from the Ancient, but *ſuch a Tradition, which involves an evidence of Fact, and from hand to hand, from age to age, bringing us up to the times and perſons of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other Arguments, whereby they convinced their*

their doctrine to be true. Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture which you receive by ſuch Tradition, and we will allow it. Prove your whole doctrine, or the infallibility of your Church by ſuch a Tradition, and we will yield to you in all things. Take the alleaged places of S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Auſtin*, in this ſenſe, (which is your own,) and they will not preſs us any thing at all. We will ſay, with *Athanaſius*, *That only four Geſpels are to be received, becauſe the Canons of the Holy and Catholique Church* (underſtand of *all Ages* ſince the perfection of the Canon) *have ſo determined.*

54. We will ſubſcribe to S. *Auſtin*, and ſay, That *we alſo would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholique Church did move us*, (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages*, and that ſucceſſion of Chriſtians which takes in *Chriſt himſelf* and his *Apoſtels*.) Neither would *Zwinglius* have needed to cry out upon this ſaying, had he conceived as you now do, that by the Catholique Church, the Church of all Ages, ſince Chriſt, was to be underſtood. As for the Councel of *Carthage*, it may ſpeak not of ſuch Books only, as were certainly Canonical, and for the regulating of Faith; but alſo of thoſe which were only profitable, and lawful to be read in the Church. Which in *England* is a very ſlender Argument that the book is Canonical, where every body knows that Apocryphal books are read as well as Canonical. But howſoever, if you underſtand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predeceſſors in the Goſpel, but the ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles; they are right in the Theſis, that *whatſoever is received from theſe Fathers, as Canonical, is to be ſo eſteemed*; Though in the application of it, to this or that particular book they may haply erre, and think that book received as Canonicl, which was only received as profitable to be read; and think that Book received alwaies, and by all, which was rejected by ſome, and doubted of by many.

55. *But we cannot be certain, in what language the Scriptures remain uncorrupted.* Not ſo certain, I grant, as of that which we can demonſtrate: But certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the nature of the thing will bear: So certain we may be, and God requires no more. We may be as certain as S. *Auſtin* was, who in his *ſecond book of Baptiſm, againſt the Donatiſts*, *c.* 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might poſſibly be corrupted.* He means, ſure, in matters of little moment, ſuch as concern not the Covenant between God and Man. But thus he ſaith. The ſame S. *Auſtin* in his 48. *Epiſt.* cleerly intimates, (a) That *in his judgement, the only preſervative of the Scriptures integrity, was the tranſlating it into ſo many Languages, and the general and perpetual uſe and reading of it in the Church: for want whereof the works of particular Doctors were more expoſed to danger in this kind*; but the Canonical Scripture being by this means guarded with univerſal care and diligence, was not obnoxious to ſuch attempts. And this aſſurance of the Scriptures incorruption, is common to us with him, we therefore are as certain hereof as S. *Auſtin* was, and that, I hope, was certain enough. Yet if this does not ſatisfie you, I ſay farther, We are as certain hereof as your own *Pope Sixtus Quintus* was. He in his *Preface to his Bible* tells us, (b) That *in the perveſtigation of the true and genuine Text*,

(a) *Neque enim ſic potuit integritas atque notitia literarum quamlibet illuſtris Epiſcopi, cuſtodiri, quemadmodum Scriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & ſucceſſione celebrationis Eccleſiaſticæ cuſtoditur; contra quam non*

deſuerunt tamen, qui ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum multa conſingerent. Fruſtra quidem; quia illa ſic commendata, ſic celebrata, ſic nota eſt. Verum quid poſſit adverſus literas non Canonica authoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonſtrabit impiæ conatus audaciæ, quòd & adverſus eos quæ tanta notitiæ mole firmatæ ſunt, ſeſe erigere non prætermiſit. Aug. ep. 48. *ad* Vincent. *cont.* Donat. & Rogat. (b) *In hac germani textus perveſtigatione, ſatis perſpicue inter omnes conſtat, nullum argumentum eſſe certius ac firmius, quàm antiquorum probatorum coditum Latinorum fidem*, &c. *ſic* Sixtus in Præf.

it was perſpicuouſly manifeſt to all men, that there was no Argument more firm and certain to be relied upon, than the Faith of Ancient Books. Now this ground we have to build upon as well as he had: and therefore our certainty is as great, and ſtands upon as certain ground as his did.

56. This is not all I have to ſay in this matter. For I will add moreover, that we are as certain in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any man in your Church was, until *Clement* the eighth ſet forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar* Tranſlation. For you do not, nor cannot, without extream impudence, deny, that until then, there was great variety of Copes currant in divers parts of your Church, and thoſe very frequent in various lections: all which Copies might poſſibly be falſe in ſome things, but more than one ſort of them, could not poſſibly be true in all things. Neither were it leſs impudence to pretend, that any man in your Church, could until *Clement*'s time have any certainty what that one true Copie and Reading was, (if there were one perfectly true.) Some indeed that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might, after the Edition of that, very likely think themſelves cock-ſure of a perfect true uncorrupted Tranſlation, without being beholding to *Clement*; but how foully they were abuſed and deceived that thought ſo, the Edition of *Clemens*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a great multitude of places, doth ſufficiently demonſtrate.

57. This certainty therefore, in what language the Scripture remains uncorrupted, is it neceſſary to have it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may do well enough without it. If it be neceſſary, What became of your Church for 1500 years together? All which time, you muſt confeſs ſhe had no ſuch certainty: no one man being able truly and upon good ground to ſay, *This or that Copy of the Bible is pure, and perfect, and uncorrupted in all things.* And now at this preſent, though ſome of you are grown to a higher degree of Preſumption in this Point, yet are you as far as ever, from any true, real, and rational aſſurance of the abſolute purity of your Authentique Tranſlation: which I ſuppoſe my ſelf to have proved unanſwerably in divers places.

58. In the *ſixteenth Diviſion*, It is objected to Proteſtants in a long diſcourſe tranſcribed out of the *Proteſtant's Apology*, That *their Tranſlations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned.* Luther's *Tranſlation* by *Zwinglius*, and *others*: That *of the* Zwinglians, *by* Luther. *The Tranſlation of* Oecolampadius, *by the Divines of* Baſil: *that of* Caſtalio, *by* Beza: *That of* Beza, *by* Caſtalio. *That of* Calvin, *by* Carolus Molinæus. *That of* Geneva, *by* M. Parks, *and King* James. *And laſtly, One of our Tranſlations by the Puritans.*

59. All which might have been as juſtly objected againſt that great variety of Tranſlations extant in the Primitive Church, and made uſe of by the Fathers and Doctors of it. For which, I deſire not that my word, but S. *Auſtin*'s may be taken. *They, which have tranſlated the Scriptures out of the Hebrew into Greek, may be numbred; but the Latin Interpreters are innumerable. For, whenſoever any one, in the firſt times of Chriſtianity, met with a Greek Bible, and ſeemed to himſelf to have ſome ability in both Languages, he preſently ventured upon an Interpretation.* So *He*, in his *ſecond Book of Chriſtian doctrine. Cap.* 11. Of all theſe, that which was called *the Italian Tranſlation* was eſteemed beſt; ſo we may learn from the ſame S. *Auſtin in Chap.* 15. *of the ſame Book. Amongſt all theſe interpretations* (ſaith he) *let the Italian*

be

be preferred: for it keeps closer to the Letter, and is perspicuous in the sense. Yet so far was the Church of that time from presuming upon the absolute purity and perfection, even of this best Translation, that S. *Hierom* thought it necessary to make a new Translation, of the Old Testament, out of the Hebrew Fountain, (which himself testifies in his Book *de Viris illustribus*); and to correct the Vulgar version of the New Testament, according to the truth of the Original Greek; amending many errors which had crept into it, whether by the mistake of the Author, or the negligence of the Transcribers; which work he undertook and performed at the request of *Damasus*, Bishop of *Rome*. *You constrain me* (saith he) *to make a new work of an old: that, after the Copies of the Scriptures have been dispersed through the whole World, I should sit, as it were, an Arbitrator amongst them, and, because they vary among themselves, should determine what are those things (in them) which consent with the Greek verity.* And after: *Therefore this present Preface promises the four Gospels only, corrected by collation with Greek Copies. But, that they might not be very dissonant from the custom of the Latin reading, I have so tempered with my stile, the Translation of the Ancients, that, those things amended which did seem to change the sense, other things I have suffered to remain as they were.* So that in this matter Protestants must either stand or fall with the Primitive Church.

60. *The Corruption that you charge* Luther *with, and the falsification that you impute to* Zwinglius, What have we to do with them? Or why may not we as justly lay to your charge the Errours, which *Lyranus*, or *Paulus Brugensis*, or *Laurentius Valla*, or *Cajetan*, or *Erasmus*, or *Arias Montanus*, or *Augustus Nebiensis*, or *Pagnine*, have committed in their Translations?

61. Which yet I say not, as if these Translations of *Luther* and *Zwinglius* were absolutely indefensible; for what such great difference is there between *Faith without the Works of the Law*, and *Faith alone without the Works of the Law?* Or why does not, *Without*, *Alone*, signifie all one with, *Alone*, *Without?* Consider the matter a little better, and observe the use of these phrases of speech in our ordinary talk, and perhaps you will begin to doubt whether you had sufficient ground for this invective. And then for *Zwinglius*, if it be true (as they say it is) that the language our Saviour spake in, had no such word as *To signifie*, but used always, *to be*, in stead of it, as it is certain the Scripture does in an hundred places; then this Translation, which you so declaim against, will prove no falsification in *Zwinglius*, but a calumny in you.

62. *But the faith of Protestants relies upon Scripture alone; Scripture is delivered to most of them by Translations; Translations depend upon the skill and honesty of Men, who certainly may err because they are Men, and certainly do err, at least some of them, because their Translations are contrary. It seems then the Faith, and consequently the Salvation of Protestants, relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.*

63. This Objection, though it may seem to do you great service for the present; yet I fear, you will repent the time that ever you urged it against us as a fault, that we make mens salvation *depend upon uncertainties*; For the Objection returns upon you many ways, as first thus; The salvation of many millions of Papists (as they suppose and teach) depends upon their having the Sacrament of Pennance truly administred unto them. This again upon the Minister's being a true Priest. That such or such a man is Priest,

not himſelf, much leſs any other can have any poſſible certainty: for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain ſuppoſals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, muſt undertake to know for a certain all theſe things that follow.

64. Firſt, That he was baptized with due matter. Secondly, with the due form of words, (which he cannot know, unleſs he were both preſent and attentive.) Thirdly, he muſt know that he was baptized with due Intention, and that is, that the Miniſter of his Baptiſm was not a ſecret Jew, nor a Moor, nor an Atheiſt, (of all which kinds, I fear, experience gives you juſt cauſe to fear, that *Italy* and *Spain* have Prieſts not a few) but a Chriſtian in heart, as well as Profeſſion; (otherwiſe, believing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing,) nor a *Samoſatenian*, nor an *Arrian*: but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the Doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And laſtly, That he was neither drunk nor diſtracted at the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention.

65. Fourthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop, which ordained him Prieſt, ordained him compleatly with due Matter, Form, and Intention: and conſequently, that he again was neither Jew, nor Moor, nor Atheiſt, nor liable to any ſuch exception, as is unconſiſtent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders.

66. Fifthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop, which made him Prieſt, was a Prieſt himſelf; for your Rule is, *Nihil dat quod non habet:* And conſequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his Baptiſm, which might make him incapable of Ordination; nor no invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Prieſt to ordain him again, the requiſite matter, and form, and due intention, all concurring.

67. Laſtly, he muſt pretend to know the ſame of him that made him Prieſt, and him that made Him Prieſt, even until he comes to the very fountain of Prieſthood. For, take any one in the whole train and ſucceſſion of Ordainers, and ſuppoſe him, by reaſon of any defect, only a ſuppoſed and not a true Prieſt, then according to your Doctrine he could not give a true, but only a ſuppoſed Prieſthood; and they that receive it of him, and again they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and ſhadow, can give nothing but a name and ſhadow: and ſo from age to age, from generation to generation, ſeeing equivocal Fathers beget only equivocal Sons; No Principle in Geometry being more certain than this, That *the unſuppliable defect of any neceſſary Antecedent, muſt needs cauſe a nullity of all thoſe Conſequences which depend upon it.* In fine, to know this one thing you muſt firſt know ten thouſand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known, there being no neceſſity that it ſhould be true, which only can qualifie any thing for an object of Science, but only, at the beſt, a high degree of probability that it is ſo. But then, that of ten thouſand probables, no one ſhould be falſe; that of ten thouſand requiſites, whereof any one may fail, not one ſhould be wanting, this to me is extreamly improbable. and even couſin-german to Impoſſible. So that the aſſurance hereof is like a Machin compoſed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is ſtrangely unlikely but ſome will be out of order; and yet, if any one be ſo, the whole

Fabrick

Fabrick of neceſſity falls to the ground. And he that ſhall put them together, and maturely conſider all the poſſible ways of lapſing, and nullifying a Prieſthood in the Church of *Rome*, I believe, will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that, amongſt an hundred ſeeming Prieſts, there is not one true one. Nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that, amongſt thoſe many millions, which make up the Romiſh Hierarchy, there are *not twenty* true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that They, which make mens ſalvation (as you do) depend upon Prieſtly Abſolution; and this again (as you do) upon the Truth and reality of the Prieſthood that gives it; and this laſtly upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fitteſt men in the world, to object to others, as a horrible crime, *That they make mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain foundations.* And let this be the firſt retortion of your Argument.

68. But ſuppoſe, this difficulty aſſoyled, and that an Angel from Heaven ſhould aſcertain you (for other aſſurances you can have none) that the perſon you make uſe of, is a true Prieſt, and a competent Miniſter of the Sacrament of Pennance; yet ſtill the doubt will remain, Whether he will do you that good which he can do, whether he will pronounce the abſolving words with intent to abſolve you! For perhaps, he may bear you ſome ſecret malice, and project to himſelf your damnation, for a compleat Italian revenge. Perhaps (as the tale is of a Prieſt that was lately burnt in *France*) he may upon ſome conditions have compacted with the Devil to give no Sacraments with Intention. Laſtly, he may be (for ought you can poſſibly know) a ſecret Jew, or Moor, or Anti-Trinitarian, or perhaps ſuch a one as is ſo far from intending your forgiveneſs of ſins and ſalvation by this Sacrament, that in his heart he laughs at all theſe things, and thinks Sin nothing, and Salvation a word. All theſe doubts you muſt have clearly reſolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelation,) before you can upon good grounds aſſure your ſelf, that your true Prieſt gives you true and effectual abſolution. So that when you have done as much as God requires for your Salvation, yet can you by no means be ſecure, but that you may have the ill luck to be damned: which is to make Salvation a matter of chance, and not of choice; and which a man may fail of, not only by an ill life, but by ill fortune. Verily, a moſt comfortable Doctrine for a conſidering man lying upon his death-bed, who, either feels or fears that his repentance is but attrition only, and not contrition, and conſequently believes, that, if he be not abſolved really by a true Prieſt, he cannot poſſibly eſcape damnation. Such a man for his comfort, you tell, firſt (you that will have *mens ſalvation depend upon no uncertainties*) that though he verily believe that his ſorrow for ſins is a true ſorrow, and his purpoſe of amendment a true purpoſe; yet he may deceive himſelf, perhaps it is not; and, if it be not, he muſt be damned. Yet you bid him hope well: But, *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen.* You tell him ſecondly, that though the party he confeſſes to, ſeem to be a true Prieſt, yet, for ought he knows, or, for ought himſelf knows, by reaſon of ſome ſecret undiſcernible invalidity in his Baptiſm or Ordination, he may be none, and if he be none, he can do nothing. This is a hard ſaying, but this is not the worſt. You tell him thirdly, that he may be in ſuch a ſtate that he cannot, or, if he can, that he will not give the Sacrament with due Intenti-

on:

on: and, if he does not, all is in vain. Put caſe, a man by theſe conſideration ſhould be caſt into ſome agonies; what advice, what comfort would you give him? Verily, I know not what you could ſay to him, but this; that, firſt for the Qualification required on his part, he might know that he deſired to have true ſorrow, and that that is ſufficient. But then, if he ſhould ask you, Why he might not know his ſorrow to be a true ſorrow, as well as his deſire to be ſorrowful, to be a true deſire; I believe you would be put to ſilence. Then ſecondly, to quiet his fears, concerning the Prieſt and his Intention you ſhould tell him, by my advice, that God's goodneſs (which will not ſuffer him to damn men for not doing better than their beſt,) will ſupply all ſuch defects, as to humane endeavours were unavoidable. And therefore though his Prieſt were indeed no Prieſt, yet to him he ſhould be as if he were one: and if he gave Abſolution without Intention, yet in doing ſo he ſhould hurt himſelf only and not his penitent. This were ſome comfort indeed, and this were to ſettle mens ſalvation upon reaſonable certain grounds. But this, I fear, you will never ſay; for this were to reverſe many Doctrines eſtabliſhed by your Church; and beſides, to degrade your Prieſthood from a great part of their honour, by leſſening the ſtrict neceſſity of the Laitie's dependance upon them. For it were to ſay, that *the Prieſts Intention is not neceſſary to the obtaining of Abſolution*; which is to ſay, that it is not in the Parſon's power to damn whom he will in his Pariſh, becauſe, by this rule, God ſhould ſupply the defect which his malice had cauſed. And beſides, it were to ſay, that, *Infants dying without Baptiſm might be ſaved*, God ſupplying the want of Baptiſm which to them is unavoidable. But beyond all this, it were to put into my mouth a full and ſatisfying Anſwer to your Argument, which I am now returning; ſo that in anſwering my Objection you ſhould anſwer your own. For then I ſhould tell you, that it were altogether as abhorrent from the goodneſs of God, and as repugnant to it, to ſuffer an ignorant Lay-man's ſoul to periſh, meerly for being miſled by an undiſcernable falſe Tranſlation, which yet was commended to him by the Church, which (being of neceſſity to credit ſome in this matter) he had reaſon to relie upon, either above all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damn a penitent ſinner for a ſecret defect in that deſired Abſolution, which his Ghoſtly Father perhaps was an Atheiſt, and could not give him, or was a villain and would not. This anſwer therefore, which alone would ſerve to comfort your penitent in his perplexities, and to aſſure him that he cannot fail of Salvation if he will not, for fear of inconvenience you muſt forbear. And ſeeing you muſt, I hope you will, come down from the Pulpit, and preach no more againſt others for *making mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain grounds*, leſt by judging others, you make your ſelves, and your own Church inexcuſable, who are ſtrongly guilty of this fault, above all the men and Churches of the World: whereof I have already given you two very pregnant demonſtrations, drawn from your preſumptuous tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments; And the efficacy of them to your Prieſt's Qualifications and Intentions.

69. Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptiſm a Caſual thing, and in the power of man to conferre, or not conferre, would yield me a Third of the ſame nature. And your ſuſpending the ſame on the Baptizer's Intention, a Fourth. And laſtly, your making the Real preſence

ſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt depend upon the caſualties of the Conſecrator's true Prieſthood and Intention, and yet commanding men to believe it for certain that he is preſent, and to adore the Sacrament, which, according to your Doctrine, for ought they can poſſibly know, may be nothing elſe but a piece of Bread, ſo expoſing them to the danger of Idolatry, and conſequently of damnation, doth offer me a Fifth demonſtration of the ſame Concluſion, if I thought fit to inſiſt upon them. But I have no mind to draw any more out of this Fountain; neither do I think it charity to cloy the Reader with uniformity, when the Subject affords variety.

70. Sixthly, therefore, I return it thus. The faith of Papiſts relies alone upon their Churche's infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and, that Theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudential Motives*. Dependance upon prudential Motives they confeſs to be obnoxious to a poſſibility of erring. What then remaineth, but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, muſt in them relie upon a fallible and uncertain ground!

71. Seventhly, The Faith of Papiſts relies upon the Church alone. The Doctrine of the Church is delivered to moſt of them by their Pariſh-Prieſt, or Ghoſtly Father, or, at leaſt, by a company of Prieſts, who, for the moſt part, ſure, are men and not Angels, in whom nothing is more certain than a moſt certain poſſibility to err. What then remaineth, but that Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, muſt in them relie upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

72. Eighthly thus. It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thouſands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better grounds, than a man may have for the belief almoſt of any Religion. As ſome believe it, becauſe their Forefathers did ſo, and they were good People. Some, becauſe they were Chriſtened, and brought up in it. Some, becauſe many Learned and Religious men are of it. Some, becauſe it is the Religion of their Countrey, where all other Religions are perſecuted and proſcribed. Some, becauſe Proteſtants cannot ſhew a perpetual ſucceſſion of Profeſſors of all their Doctrines. Some, becauſe the ſervice of your Church is more ſtately, and pompous, and magnificent. Some, becauſe they find comfort in it. Some, becauſe your Religion is farther ſpread, and hath more Profeſſors of it, than the Religion of Proteſtants. Some, becauſe *your Prieſts compaſs Sea and Land to gain Proſelytes to it*. Laſtly, an infinite number, by chance, and they know not why, but only becauſe they are ſure they are in the right. This which I ſay, is a moſt certain experimented truth, and, if you will deal ingenuouſly, you will not deny it. And, without queſtion, he that builds his faith upon our *Engliſh Tranſlation*, goes upon a more prudent ground than any of theſe can, with reaſon, be pretended to be. What then can you alledge but that with you, rather than with us, Truth, and Faith, and Salvation, and All, relie upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

73. Ninthly. Your *Rhemiſh* and *Doway* Tranſlations are delivered to your Proſelytes, (ſuch, I mean, that are diſpenced with, for the reading of them,) for the direction of their Faith and Lives. And the ſame may be ſaid of your Tranſlations of the Bible into other National languages, in reſpect of thoſe that are licenced to read them. This, I preſume, you will confeſs. And moreover, that theſe Tranſlations came not by inſpiration, but were the productions of humane Induſtry; and that, not Angels, but men, were the Authors of them. Men, I ſay, meer men, ſubject to the ſame paſ-

ſions,

sions, and to the same possibility of erring with our Translators. And then how does it not unavoidably follow, that in them which depend upon these Translations for their direction, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and All, relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

74. Tenthly and lastly (to lay the ax to the root of the tree) the *Helena* which you so fight for, your vulgar Translation, though some of you believe, or pretend to believe it to be in every part and particle of it, the pure and uncorupted Word of God; yet others among you, and those as good and zealous Catholiques as you, are not so confident hereof.

75. First, for all those who have made Translations of the whole Bible or any part of it different many times in sense from the Vulgar, as *Lyranus, Cajetan, Pagnine, Arias, Erasmus, Valla, Steuchus*, and others, it is apparent and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any absolute perfection and authentical infallibility of the *Vulgar Translation*. For, if they had, Why did they in many places reject it and differ from it?

76. *Vega* was present at the Councel of *Trent*, when that Decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the world) *authentical*, and not to be rejected upon any pretence whatsoever. At the forming this Decree, *Vega* I say, was present, understood the mind of the Councel, as well as any man, and professes that he was instructed in it by the *President* of it, the *Cardinal S. Cruce*. And yet he hath written that *the Councel in this Decree meant to pronounce this Translation free* (not simply from all Error) *but only from such Errors, out of which any opinion pernitious to faith and manners might be collected*. This, *Andradius* in his defence of that Councel reports of *Vega*, and assents to it himself. *Driedo*, in his *Book of the Translation of holy Scripture*, hath these words very pregnant and pertinent to the same purpose; *The See Apostolike, hath approved or accepted* Hierom's *Edition, not as so wholly consonant to the Original, and so entire, and pure, and restored in all things, that it may not be lawful for any man, either by comparing it with the Fountain to examine it, or, in some places to doubt, Whether or no* Hierom *did understand the true sense of the Scripture; but only, as an Edition to be preferred before all others then extant, and no where deviating from the Truth in the rules of faith and good life*. *Mariana*, even where he is a most earnest Advocate for the Vulgar Edition, yet acknowledges the imperfection of it in these words, *The faults of the Vulgar Edition are not approved by the Decree of the Councel of* Trent, *a multitude whereof we did collect from the variety of Copie*. And again, *We maintain that the Hebrew and Greek, were by no means rejected by the Trent-Fathers: And that the Latine Edition is indeed approved; yet not so, as if they did deny that some places might be translated more plainly, some more properly; whereof it were easie to produce innumerable examples*. And this he there professes to have *learnt of* Laines *the then General of the Society*: who was a great part of that Councel, present at all the Actions of it, and of very great authority in it.

Pro Edit. vulg. c. 21. p 99.

77. To this so great authority he adds a reason of his opinion; which with all indifferent men will be of a far greater authority. *If the Councel* (saith he) *had purposed to approve an Edition in all respects, and to make it of equal authority and credit with the Fountains, certainly they ought with exact care first to have corrected the Errors of the Interpreter*: which certainly they did not.

78. Lastly,

78. Laſtly, *Bellarmine* himſelf, though he will not acknowledge any imperfection in the Vulgar Edition, yet he acknowledges that the caſe may, and does oft-times, ſo fall out, that *it is impoßible to diſcern which is the true reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourſe unto the Originals, and dependance upon them.* *Bell. de verbo Dei. l. 2. c. 11. p. 120.*

79. From all which it may evidently be collected, that, though ſome of you flatter your ſelves with a vain imagination of the certain abſolute purity and perfection of your Vulgar Edition; yet the matter is not ſo certain, and ſo reſolved, but that the beſt learned men amongſt you are often at a ſtand, and very doubtful ſometimes whether your Vulgar Tranſlation be true, and ſometimes whether this or that be your Vulgar Tranſlation, and ſometimes undoubtedly reſolved that your Vulgar Tranſlation is no true Tranſlation, nor conſonant to the Original, as it was at firſt delivered. And what then can be alledged, but that out of your own grounds it may be inferred and inforced upon you, that not only in your Lay-men, but your Clergy-men and Scholars, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and All, depends upon fallible and uncertain grounds? And thus, by ten ſeveral retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to ſhew you, How ill you have complyed with your own advice, which was *to take heed of urging Arguments that might be returned upon you.* I ſhould now, by a direct Anſwer, ſhew, that it preſſeth not us at all: but I have in paſſing, done it already in the end of the ſecond retortion of this Argument, and thither I refer the Reader.

80. Whereas therefore you exhort them *that will have aſſurance of true Scriptures, to fly to your Church for it:* I deſire to know (if they ſhould follow your advice) how they ſhould be aſſured that your Church can give them any ſuch aſſurance; which hath been *confeſſedly* ſo negligent, as to ſuffer many *whole Books of Scripture* to be utterly loſt. Again, in thoſe that remain, confeſſedly ſo negligent as to ſuffer *the Originals of theſe that remain to be corrupted.* And laſtly, ſo careleſs of preſerving the integrity of the Copies of her Tranſlation, as to ſuffer *infinite variety of Readings* to come in to them, without keeping *any one perfect Copy*, which might have been as the Standard, and *Polycletus* his Canon, to correct the reſt by. So that *which was the true reading, and which the falſe, it was utterly undiſcernable, but only by comparing them with the Originals*, which alſo ſhe pretends *to be corrupted.*

81. But Luther *himſelf, by unfortunate experience, was at length enforced to confeſs thus much, ſaying, If the world laſt longer, it will be again neceſſary to receive the Decrees of Councels, by reaſon of divers interpretations of Scripture which now raign.*

82. And what if *Luther*, having a *Pope in his belly*, (as he was wont to ſay that moſt men had,) and deſiring perhaps to have his own interpretations paſs without examining, ſpake ſuch words in heat of Argument? Do you think it reaſonable that we ſhould ſubſcribe to *Luther*'s divinations and angry ſpeeches? Will you oblige your ſelf to anſwer for all the aſſertions of your private Doctors? If not; Why do you trouble us with what *Luther* ſays, and what *Calvin* ſays? Yet this I ſay not, as if theſe words of *Luther* made any thing at all for your preſent purpoſe. For what if he feared, or pretended to fear, that, the infallibility of Councels being rejected, ſome men would fall into greater Errors than were impoſed upon

upon them be the Councels? Is this to confeſs that there is any preſent viſible Church, upon whoſe bare Authority we may infallibly receive the true Scriptures and the true ſenſe of them? Let the Reader judge. But, in my opinion, to fear a greater inconvenience may follow from the avoiding of the leſs, is not to confeſs that the leſs is none at all.

83. For D. *Covel's commending your Tranſlation*, What is it to the buſineſs in hand? Or how proves it the perfection of it, which is here conteſted, any more than S. *Auguſtine*'s commending the *Italian* Tranſlation, argues the perfection of that, or that there was no neceſſity that S. *Hierom* ſhould correct it? D. *Covel* commends your Tranſlation, and ſo does the *Biſhop of Chicheſter*, and ſo does D. *James*, and ſo do I. But I commend it for a *good* Tranſlation, not for a *perfect*. Good may be good, and deſerve commendations; and yet Better may be better. And though he ſays, that *the then approved Tranſlation of the Church of* England, *is that which cometh neareſt the Vulgar*, yet he does not ſay, that it agrees exactly with it. So that whereas you infer, *that the Truth of your Tranſlation muſt be the Rule to judge of the goodneſs of ours*: this is but a vain flouriſh. For, to ſay of our Tranſlations, That is the beſt which comes neareſt the Vulgar, (and yet it is but one man that ſays ſo,) is not to ſay, it is therefore the beſt becauſe it does ſo. For this may be true by accident, and yet the truth of our Tranſlation no way depend upon the truth of yours. For, had that been their direction, they would not only have made a Tranſlation that ſhould come near to yours, but ſuch a one which ſhould exactly agree with it, and be a Tranſlation of your Tranſlation.

84. *Ad* 17. §. In this Diviſion you charge us, *with great uncertainty, concerning the true meaning of Scripture*. Which hath been anſwered already, by ſaying, That, if you ſpeak of plain places, (and in ſuch all things neceſſary are contained,) we are ſufficiently certain of the meaning of them, neither need they any Interpreter. If of obſcure and difficult places, we confeſs we are uncertain of the ſenſe of many of them. But then we ſay there is no neceſſity we ſhould be certain. For, if God's will had been, we ſhould have underſtood him more certainly, he would have ſpoken more plainly. And we ſay beſides, that as we are uncertain, ſo are You too; which he that doubts of, let him read your Commentators upon the Bible, and obſerve their various and diſſonant interpretations, and he ſhall in this point need no further ſatisfaction.

85. But ſeeing *there are contentions among us, we are taught by nature and Scripture, and experience* (ſo you tell us out of M. *Hooker to ſeek for the ending of them, by ſubmitting unto ſome Judicial ſentence, whereunto neither part may refuſe to ſtand*. This is very true. Neither ſhould you need to perſwade us to ſeek ſuch a means of ending all our Controverſies, if we could tell where to find it. But this we know, that none is fit to pronounce for all the world a judicial definitive obliging ſentence in Controverſies of Religion, but only ſuch a Man, or ſuch a ſociety of Men, as is authorized thereto by God. And beſides, we are able to demonſtrate, that it hath not been the pleaſure of God to give to any Man, or Society of Men, any ſuch authority. And therefore, though we wiſh heartily that all Controverſies were ended, as we do that all ſin were aboliſht, yet we have little hope of the one, or the other, till the World be ended. And in the mean while, think it beſt to content our ſelves with, and to perſwade others unto, an

Unity

Unity of Charity, and mutual Toleration; ſeeing God hath authorized no man to force all men to *Unity of Opinion*. Neither do we think it fit to argue thus, To us it ſeems convenient there ſhould be one Judge of all Controverſies for the whole world, therefore God hath appointed one: But more modeſt and more reaſonable to collect thus, God hath appointed no ſuch Judge of Controverſies, therefore, though it ſeems to us convenient there ſhould be one, yet it is not ſo: Or though it were convenient for us to have one, yet it hath pleaſed God (for Reaſons beſt known to Himſelf) not to allow us this convenience.

86. D. *Field*'s words which follow, I confeſs, are ſomewhat more preſſing: and, if he had been infallible, and the words had not ſlipt unadviſedly from him, they were the beſt Argument in your Book. But yet it is evident out of his Book, and ſo acknowledged by ſome of your own, That he never thought of any one company of Chriſtians inveſted with ſuch authority from God, that all men were bound to receive their Decrees without examination, though they ſeem contrary to Scripture and Reaſon, which the Church of *Rome* requires. And therefore, if he have in his Preface ſtrained too high in commendation of the Subject he writes of, (as Writers very often do in their Prefaces and Dedicatory Epiſtles) what is that to us? Beſides, by *all the Societies of the World*, it is not impoſſible, nor very improbable, he might mean, all that are, or have been in the world, and ſo include even the *Primitive Church*: and her Communion we ſhall embrace, her Direction we ſhall follow, her Judgement we ſhall reſt in; if we believe the Scripture, endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and live according to it.

87. *Ad* §. 18. That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be received from the Church, you need not prove; for it is very eaſily granted by them, who profeſs themſelves very ready to receive all Truths, much more the true ſenſe of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any ſociety of men, nay from any man whatſoever.

88. That the *Churche's Interpretation of Scripture is alwayes true*, that is it which you would have ſaid: and that in ſome ſenſe may be alſo admitted, *viz.* if you ſpeak of that Church (which before you ſpake of in the 14. §.) that is, of the Church of all Ages ſince the Apoſtles. Upon the Tradition of which Church you there told us, *we were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God*. For there you teach us, That *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle, which requires no other proof*; And that, *ſuch is Tradition, which, from hand to hand, and age to age, bringing us up to the Times and Perſons of the Apoſtles and our Saviour himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all theſe Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrin to be true*. Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the ſacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church. The Tradition then of this Church you ſay muſt teach us what is Scripture: and we are willing to believe it. And now, if you make it good unto us, that the ſame Tradition down from the Apoſtles, hath delivered from age to age, and from hand to hand, any interpretation of any Scripture, we are ready to embrace that alſo. But now, if you will argue thus: The Church in one ſenſe tells us what is Scripture, and we believe it; therefore, if the Church, taken in another ſenſe, tell us, This or that is the meaning of the Scripture, we are to believe that alſo; this is too tranſparent Sophiſtry, to take any but thoſe that are willing to be taken.

89. If there be any Traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be so; and we embrace it. But the Tradition of all ages is one thing; and the Authority of the present Church, much more of the *Roman* Church, which is but a Part, and a corrupted Part, of the Catholique Church, is another. And therefore, though we are ready to receive both Scripture, and the sense of Scripture upon the Authority of *Original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one, nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90. First for the Scripture, How can we receive them upon the Authority of your Church, who hold now those Books to be Canonical, which formerly you rejected from the Canon? I instance in the *Book of Macchabees*, and the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. The first of these you held not to be Canonical in S. *Gregorie*'s time, or else he was no member of your Church; for it is apparent (a) He held otherwise. The second you rejected from the Canon in S. *Hierom*'s time, as it is evident out of (b) many places of his Works.

(a) See *Greg. Mor. l.* 19. *c.* 13.
(b) Thus he testifies. *Com. in. Esa. c.* 6. in these words. *Unde & Paulus Apost. in Epist. ad Heb.* (*quam Latina consuetudo non recipit.*) And again in c. 8. in these. *In Epist. quæ ad Hebræos scribitur, (licèt eam Latina Consuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.*) &c.

91. If you say (which is all you can say) that Hierom *spake this of the particular* Roman *Church, not of the* Roman *Catholique Church*; I answer, there was none such in his time, None that was called so. Secondly, What he spake of the *Roman* Church, must be true of all other Churches, if your Doctrine of the necessity of the Conformity of all other Churches to that Church, were then Catholique Doctrine. Now then chuse whether you will, Either that the particular *Roman* Church was not then believed to be the Mistress of all other Churches (notwithstanding, *Ad hanc Ecclesiam, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, omnes qui sunt undique fideles*; which Cardinal *Perron*, and his *Translatress* so often translates false: Or, if you say she was, you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to say, that all the Churches of that time rejected from the Canon, the Epistle to the Hebrews, together with the *Roman* Church. And consequently, that the Catholique Church may err in rejecting from the Canon, Scriptures truly Canonical.

92. Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the Authority of the *Roman* Church, which hath delivered at several times Scriptures in many places different and repugnant, for Authentical and Canonical? Which is most evident out of the place of *Malachy*, which is so quoted for the Sacrifice of the Mass, that either all the ancient Fathers had false Bibles, or yours is false. Most evident likewise from the comparing of the story of *Jacob* in *Genesis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, according to the vulgar Edition. But above all, to any one who shall compare the Bibles of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, so evident, that the wit of man cannot disguise it.

93. And thus you see what reason we have to believe your Antecedent, *That your Church it is which must declare, what Books be true Scripture.* Now, for the consequence, that certainly is as liable to exception as the Antecedent. For, if it were true, that God had promised to assist you, for the delivering of true Scripture, would this oblige Him, or would it follow from hence that He had obliged himself, to teach you, not only sufficiently, but *effectually* and *irresistibly* the true sense of Scripture? God is not defective in things necessary: neither will he leave himself without witness, or the World without means of knowing his will and doing it. And therefore it was necessary that by his Providence he should preserve the Scripture from

from any undiſcernable corruption, in thoſe things which he would have known: otherwiſe it is apparent, it had not been his will, that theſe things ſhould be known, the only means of continuing the knowledge of them being periſhed. But now neither is God laviſh in ſuperfluities, and therefore having given us means ſufficient for our direction, and power ſufficient to make uſe of theſe means, he will not conſtrain or neceſſitate us to make uſe of theſe means. For that were to croſs the end of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free obedience: whereas Neceſſity and Freedom cannot ſtand together. That were to reverſe the Law which he hath preſcribed to himſelf in his dealing with Man; and that is, *to ſet life and death before him, and to leave him in the hands of his own Counſel.* God gave the Wiſemen a Star to lead them to *Chriſt*, but he did not neceſſitate them to follow the guidance of this Star: that was left to their liberty. God gave the Children of *Iſrael a Fire to lead them by night, and a Pillar of Cloud by day*; but he conſtrained no man to follow them: that was left to their liberty. So he gives the Church the Scripture: which in thoſe things which are to be believed or done, are plain and eaſie to be followed, like the Wiſemen's Star. Now that, which he deſires of us on our part, is, the Obedience of Faith, and love of the Truth, and deſire to find the true ſenſe of it, and induſtry in ſearching it, and humility in following, and Conſtancy in profeſſing it: all which, if he ſhould work in us by an abſolute irreſiſtible neceſſity, he could no more require of us as our duty, than he can of the Sun to ſhine, of the Sea to ebb and flow, and of all other Creatures to do thoſe things which by meer neceſſity, they muſt do, and cannot chuſe. Beſides, What an impudence is it to pretend that *your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of the Scripture*; whereas there are thouſands of places of Scripture, which you do not pretend certainly to underſtand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themſelves? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, why do not your Doctors follow her infallible direction? And, if they do, How comes ſuch difference among them in their Interpretations?

94. Again, Why does your Church thus put her Candle under a Buſhel, and keep her Talent of interpreting Scripture infallibly, thus long wrapt up in napkins? Why ſets ſhe not forth Infallible Commentaries or Expoſitions upon all the Bible? Is it, becauſe this would not be profitable for Chriſtians, that Scripture ſhould be interpreted? It is blaſphemous to ſay ſo. The Scripture it ſelf tells us, *All Scripture is profitable.* And the Scripture is not ſo much the Words as the Senſe. And, if it be not profitable, Why does ſhe imploy particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unleſs we muſt think that fallible interpretations of Scripture are profitable, and infallible interpretations would not be ſo?

95. If you ſay, *The Holy Ghoſt, which aſſiſts the Church in interpreting, will move the Church to interpret when he ſhall think fit, and that the Church will do it when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall move her to do it.* I demand, Whether the Holy Ghoſt's moving of the Church to ſuch works as theſe, be reſiſtible by the Church, or irreſiſtible. If reſiſtible, then the Holy Ghoſt may move, and the Church may not be moved. As certainly the Holy Ghoſt doth always move to an action, when he ſhews us plainly, that it would be for the good of men, and honour of God: As he that hath any ſenſe

will acknowledge that an infallible expoſition of Scripture could not but be; and there is no conceivable reaſon, Why ſuch a work ſhould be put off a day, but only becauſe you are conſcious to your ſelves, you cannot do it, and therefore make excuſes. But if the moving of the Holy Ghoſt be irreſiſtible, and you are not yet ſo moved to go about this work; then I confeſs you are excuſed. But then I would know, Whether thoſe Popes, which ſo long deferred the calling of a Councel for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Councel of *Trent*, whether they may excuſe themſelves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghoſt to do it? I would know likewiſe, as this motion is irreſiſtible when it comes, ſo whether it be ſo ſimply neceſſary to the moving of your Church to any ſuch publique Action, that it cannot poſſibly move without it? That is, Whether the Pope now could not, if he would, ſeat himſelf *in Cathedra*, and fall to writing Expoſitions upon the Bible for the direction of Chriſtians to the true ſenſe of it? If you ſay, He cannot, you will make your ſelf ridiculous. If he can, then I would know, Whether he ſhould be infallibly directed in theſe Expoſitions, or no? If he ſhould, then what need he to ſtay for irreſiſtible motion? Why does he not go about this noble work preſently? If he ſhould not, How ſhall we know that the calling of the Councel of *Trent* was not upon his own voluntary motion, or upon humane importunity and ſuggeſtion, and not upon the motion of the Holy Ghoſt? And conſequently, How ſhall we know whether he were aſſiſtant to it or no, ſeeing He aſſiſts none but what He himſelf moves to? And whether He did move the Pope to call this Councel, is a ſecret thing, which we cannot poſſibly know, nor perhaps the Pope himſelf.

96. If you ſay, your meaning is only, *That the Church ſhall be infallibly guarded from giving any falſe ſenſe of any Scripture, and not infallibly aſſiſted poſitively to give the true ſenſe of all Scripture:* I put to you your own Queſtion, Why ſhould we believe the Holy Ghoſt will ſtay there? Or, Why may we not as well think he will ſtay at the firſt thing, that is, in teaching the Church what Books be true Scripture? For, if the Holy Ghoſt's aſſiſtance be promiſed to all things profitable, then will he be with them infallibly, not only to guard them from all Errors, but to guide them to all profitable truths, ſuch as the true ſenſes of all Scripture would be. Neither could he ſtay there, but defend them irreſiſtibly from all Vices; Nor there neither, but infuſe into them irreſiſtibly all Vertues: for all theſe things would be much for the benefit of Chriſtians. If you ſay, he cannot do this without taking away their freewill in living; I ſay, neither can he neceſſitate men to believe aright, without taking away their free-will in believing, and in profeſſing their belief.

97. To the place of S. *Auſtin*; I anſwer, That, not the Authority of the preſent Church, much leſs of a Part of it (as the *Roman* Church is) was that which alone moved S. *Auſtin* to believe the Goſpel, but the perpetual Tradition of the Church of all Ages. Which you your ſelf have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is proved, and which it ſelf needs no proof*; and to which you have referred this very Saying of Saint *Auſtin, Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, niſi, &c. Chap.* 2. *c.* 14. And in the next place, which you cite out of his Book *De Util. Cred. c.* 14. he ſhews, That his *motives to believe, were Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity.*

And

And ſeeing this Tradition, this Conſent, this Antiquity did as fully and powerfully move him not to believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpel, (the Chriſtian Tradition being as full againſt *Manichæus* as it was for the Goſpel) therefore he did well to conclude upon theſe grounds, that he had as much reaſon to diſ-believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpel. Now, if you can truly ſay, that the ſame Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity, that the ſame Univerſal and Original Tradition, lies againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did againſt *Manichæus*, you may do well to apply the Argument againſt them; otherwiſe it will be to little purpoſe to ſubſtitute their names inſtead of *Manichæus*, unleſs you can ſhew the thing agrees to them as well as him.

98. If you ſay that S. *Auſtin ſpeaks here of the authority of the preſent Church, abſtracted from conſent with the Ancient*, and therefore you, ſeeing you have the preſent Church on your ſide againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as S. *Auſtin* againſt *Manichæus*, may urge the ſame words againſt them which S. *Auſtin* did againſt him.

99. I anſwer, Firſt, That it is a vain preſumption of yours that the *Catholique Church is of your ſide*. Secondly, that, if S. *Auſtin* ſpeak here of that preſent Church, which moved him to believe the Goſpel, without conſideration of the Antiquity of it, and its both Perſonal and Doctrinal ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; his Argument will be like a *Buskin* that will ſerve any leg. It will ſerve to keep an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian*, from being a *Roman Catholique*, as well as a Catholique from being an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian*: In as much as the *Arrians* and *Grecians* did pretend to the title of Catholiques, and The Church, as much as the Papiſts now do. If then you ſhould have come to an ancient *Goth* or *Vandal*, whom the *Arrians* converted to Chriſtianity, and ſhould have moved him to your Religion; might he not ſay the very ſame words to you as S. *Auſtin* to the *Manichæans? I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying, Believe the Goſpel, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, Do not believe the* Homo-ouſians? *Chuſe what thou pleaſeſt: If thou ſhalt ſay, Believe the* Arrians, *they warn me not to give any credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay, Do not believe the* Arrians, *thou ſhalt not do well to force me to the faith of the* Homo-ouſians, *becauſe by the preaching of the* Arrians *I believed the Goſpel it ſelf. If you ſay, You did well to believe them, commending the Goſpel, but, you did not well to believe them, diſcommending the* Homo-ouſians: *Doſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that, without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* It were eaſie to put theſe words into the mouth of a *Grecian*, *Abyſſine*, *Georgian*, or any other of any Religion. And I pray bethink your ſelves, What you would ſay to ſuch a one in ſuch a caſe, and imagine that we ſay the very ſame to you.

100. Whereas you ask, *Whether Proteſtants do not perfectly reſemble thoſe men to whom S. Auſtin ſpake, when they will have men to believe the Roman Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning* Luther? I demand again, Whether you be well in your wits to ſay, that Proteſtants would have men believe the *Roman* Church delivering Scripture, whereas they accuſe her to deliver many Books for Scripture which are not ſo? and do not bid men to receive any Book which ſhe delivers, for that reaſon, becauſe ſhe delivers it? And, if you meant only, Proteſtants will have

men to believe ſome Books to be Scripture which the *Roman* Church delivers for ſuch, may not we then ask as you do, Do not Papiſts perfectly reſemble theſe men, which will have men believe the Church of *England* delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning the Church of *Rome?*

101. And whereas you ſay, S. *Auſtin may ſeem to have ſpoken Propheticall againſt Proteſtants, when he ſaid, Why ſhould I not moſt diligently enquire what Chriſt commanded of them before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing?* I anſwer. Until you can ſhew that Proteſtants believe that Chriſt commanded any good thing, that is, That they believe the Truth of Chriſtian Religion upon the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, this place muſt be wholly impertinent to your purpoſe; which is to make Proteſtants believe your Church to be the infallible Expounder of Scriptures and Judg of Controverſies: Nay rather, is it not directly againſt your purpoſe? For why may not a Member of the Church of *England*, who received his Baptiſm, Education, and Faith from the Miniſtery of this Church, ſay juſt ſo to you as S. *Auſtin* here to the *Manichees?* Why ſhould I not moſt diligently enquire, what Chriſt commanded of them (the Church of *England*) before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing? Can you, F. or K. or whoſoever you are, better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by you to me? This therefore (that *Chriſt Jeſus* did thoſe Miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Books of the New Teſtament) I believed by Fame, ſtrengthened with Celebrity and Conſent, (even of thoſe which in other things are at infinite variance one with another,) and laſtly by Antiquity (which gives an univerſal and a conſtant atteſtation to them.) But every one may ſee that you, ſo few in compariſon of all thoſe upon whoſe conſent we ground our belief of Scripture,) ſo turbulent, (that you damn all to the fire, and to Hell, that any way differ from you; that you profeſs it is lawful for you, to uſe violence and power whenſoever you can have it, for the planting of your own Doctrine, and the extirpation of the contrary;) Laſtly, ſo new in many of your Doctrines, (as in the lawfulneſs and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramental Cup; the lawfulneſs and expedience of your Latine Service, Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Pope's Infallibility, his Authority over Kings, &c. So new, I ſay, in compariſon of the undoubted Books of Scripture, which evidently containeth, or rather is our Religion, and the ſole, and adequate object of our faith: I ſay, every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving Authority (with wiſe and conſiderate men.) What madneſs is this? Believe then the conſent of Chriſtians, which are now, and have been ever ſince Chriſt in the World, that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us what Chriſt ſaid, which contradict and damn all other parts of Chriſtendom. Why, I beſeech you? Surely, if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſwade my ſelf, that I were not to believe in Chriſt, than that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him, from any other, than them by whom I believed him: at leaſt, than that I ſhould learn what his Religion was from you, who have wronged ſo exceedingly

ingly his Miracles and his Doctrine, by forging ſo evidently ſo many falſe Miracles for the Confirmation of your new Doctrine; which might give us juſt occaſion, had we no other aſſurance of them but your Authority, to ſuſpect the true ones. Who, with forging ſo many falſe Stories, and falſe Authors, have taken a fair way to make the faith of all Stories queſtionable, if we had no other ground for our Belief of them but your Authority; who have brought in Doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you confeſs to be the Word of Chriſt, and which, for the moſt part, make either for the honour or profit of the Teachers of them: which (if there were no difference between the Chriſtian and the *Roman* Church) would be very apt to make ſuſpicious men believe that Chriſtian Religion was a humane invention, taught by ſome cunning Impoſtors, only to make themſelves rich and powerful; who make a profeſſion of corrupting all ſorts of Authors: a ready courſe to make it juſtly queſtionable whether any remain uncorrupted. For, if you take this Authority upon you, upon the ſix Ages laſt paſt; how ſhall we know, that the Church of that time, did not uſurp the ſame Authority upon the Authors of the ſix laſt Ages before them, and ſo upwards, until we come to Chriſt himſelf? Whoſe queſtioned Doctrines, none of them came from the Fountain of Apoſtolike Tradition, but have inſinuated themſelves into the Streams, by little and little; ſome in one age, and ſome in another; ſome more anciently, ſome more lately; and ſome yet are Embrio's, yet hatching, and in the ſhell; as the Pope's infallibility, the bleſſed Virgin's immaculate Conception, the Pope's power over the Temporalties of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, &c. all which yet are, or in time may be, impoſed upon Chriſtians under the Title of *Original and Apoſtolike Tradition*; and that with that neceſſity, that they are told, they were as good believe nothing at all, as not believe theſe things to have come from the Apoſtles, which they know to have been brought in but yeſterday: which whether it be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus with themſelves—I am told, that I were as good believe nothing at all, as believe ſome points which the Church teacheth me, and not others: and ſome things which ſhe teacheth to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly ſee to be New and Falſe; therefore I will believe nothing at all. Whether, I ſay, the foreſaid grounds be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus; and whether this Concluſion be not too often made in *Italy*, and *Spain*, and *France*, and in *England* too, I leave it to the judgement of thoſe that have wiſdom and experience. Seeing therefore the *Roman* Church is ſo far from being a ſufficient Foundation for our Belief in Chriſt, that it is in ſundry regards a dangerous temptation againſt it; why ſhould I not much rather conclude, Seeing we receive not the knowledg of Chriſt and Scriptures from the Church of *Rome*, neither from her muſt we take his Doctrine, or the Intepretation of Scripture.

102. *Ad* ℣. 19. In this number, this Argument is contained. *The Judg of Controverſies ought to be intelligible to learned and unlearned; The Scripture is not ſo, and the Church is ſo; Therefore the Church is the Judge, and not the Scripture.*

103. To this I anſwer: As, to be underſtandible is a condition requiſite to a Judge, ſo is not that alone ſufficient to make a Judge; otherwiſe you might make your ſelf Judge of Controverſies, by arguing, The Scripture

ture is not intelligible by all, but I am; therefore I am Judge of Controverſies. If you ſay, Your intent was to conclude againſt the Scripture, and not for the Church: I demand why then, but to delude the ſimple with ſophiſtry, did you ſay in the cloſe of this §, *Such is the Church, and the Scripture is not ſuch?* but that you would leave it to them, to infer in the end, (which indeed was more than you undertook in the beginning) *Therefore the Church is Judge, and the Scripture not.* I ſay Secondly, that you ſtill run upon a falſe ſuppoſition: that God hath appointed ſome Judge of all Controverſies that may happen among Chriſtians, about the ſenſe of obſcure Texts of Scripture: whereas he hath left every one to his liberty herein, in thoſe words of S. *Paul*, *Quiſque abundet in ſenſu ſuo, &c.* I ſay, Thirdly, Whereas ſome Proteſtants make the Scripture Judge of Controverſies, that they have the Authority of Fathers to warrant their manner of ſpeaking: as of * *Optatus*.

* *Cont. Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

104. But ſpeaking truly and properly, the Scripture is not a Judge, nor cannot be, but only a *ſufficient Rule*, for thoſe to judge by, that believe it to be the Word of God, (as the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome* both do,) what they are to believe, and what they are not to believe. I ſay ſufficiently perfect, and ſufficiently intelligible, in things neceſſary, to all that have underſtanding, whether they be learned or unlearned. And my reaſon hereof is convincing and Demonſtrative; becauſe nothing is neceſſary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to ſay, that when a place of Scripture, by reaſon of ambiguous terms, lies indifferent between divers ſenſes, whereof one is true, and the other is falſe, that God obliges men under pain of damnation, not to miſtake through error and humane frailty, is to make God a Tyrant; and to ſay that he requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain means: which is to ſay, that, like *Pharoah*, he gives no ſtraw, and requires brick; that he reaps where he ſows not; that he gathers where he ſtrews not; that he will not be pleaſed with our utmoſt endeavours to pleaſe him, without full, and exact, and never failing performance; that his will is, we ſhould do what he knows we cannot do; that he will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which, Whether it can conſiſt with his goodneſs, with his wiſdom, and with his word, I leave it to honeſt men to judge. If I ſhould ſend a ſervant to *Paris*, or *Rome*, or *Jeruſalem*, and he uſing his utmoſt diligence not to miſtake his way, yet notwithſtanding, meeting often with ſuch places where the road is divided into ſeveral wayes, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be falſe as any other, ſhould at length miſtake and go out of the way; Would not any man ſay that I were an impotent, fooliſh and unjuſt Maſter, if I ſhould be offended with him for doing ſo? And ſhall we not tremble to impute that to God, which we would take in foul ſcorn, if it were imputed to our ſelves? Certainly, I, for my part, fear, I ſhould not love God, if I ſhould think ſo ſtrangely of him.

105. Again, when you ſay, *That unlearned and ignorant men cannot underſtand Scripture*, I would deſire you to come out of the Clouds, and tell us what you mean: Whether, that they cannot underſtand all Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand any Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand ſo much as is ſufficient for their direction to heaven. If the firſt, I believe the

the Learned are in the ſame caſe. If the ſecond, Every man's experience will confute you: for, Who is there that is not capable of a ſufficient underſtanding of the Story, the Precepts, the Promiſes, and the Threats of the Goſpel? If the third, that they may underſtand ſomething, but not enough for their Salvations; I ask you, firſt, Why then doth S. *Paul* ſay to *Timothy, The Scriptures are able to make him wiſe unto Salvation?* Why doth Saint *Auſtin* ſay, *Ea quæ manifeſtè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem, Moreſque vivendi?* Why does every one of the four Evangeliſts intitle their Book *The Goſpel*, if any neceſſary and eſſential part of the Goſpel were left out of it? Can we imagine, that either they omitted ſomething neceſſary, out of ignorance not knowing it to be neceſſary? Or, knowing it to be ſo, maliciouſly concealed it? Or, out of negligence, did the work they have undertaken by halfs? If none of theſe things can without Blaſphemy be imputed to them, conſidering they were aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in this work, then certainly it moſt evidently follows, that every one of them writ the whole Goſpel of Chriſt; I mean, all the eſſential and neceſſary parts of it. So that, if we had no other Book of Scripture, but one of them alone, we ſhould not want any thing neceſſary to Salvation. And what one of them hath more than another, it is only profitable and not neceſſary. Neceſſary indeed to be believed, becauſe revealed; but not therefore revealed, becauſe neceſſary to be believed.

106. Neither did they write only for the learned, but for all men. This being one eſpecial means of the preaching of the Goſpel, which was commanded to be preached, not only to learned men, but *to all men*. And therefore, unleſs we will imagine the Holy Ghoſt and them, to have been wilfully wanting to their own deſire and purpoſe, we muſt conceive, that they intended to ſpeak plain, even to the capacity of the ſimpleſt; at leaſt, touching all things neceſſary to be publiſhed by them, and believed by us.

107. And whereas you pretend it *is ſo eaſie, and obvious both for the learned and the ignorant, both to know, Which is the Church, and what are the Decrees of the Church, and what is the ſenſe of thoſe Decrees*: I ſay, this is a vain pretence.

108. For firſt, How ſhall an unlearned man whom you have ſuppoſed now ignorant of Scripture, how ſhall he know which of all the Societies of Chriſtians is indeed the Church? You will ſay perhaps, *He muſt examine them by the notes of the Church, which are, perpetual Viſibility, Succeſſion, Conformity with the Ancient Church*, &c. But how ſhall he know, firſt, that theſe are the notes of the Church, unleſs by Scripture, w^ch, you ſay, he underſtands not? You may ſay perhaps, he may be told ſo. But ſeeing men may deceive, and be deceived, and their words are no demonſtrations, How ſhall he be aſſured that what they ſay is true? So that at the firſt he meets with an impregnable difficulty, and cannot know the Church but by ſuch notes, which whether they be the notes of the Church he cannot poſſibly know. But let us ſuppoſe this *Iſthmus* digged through, and that he is aſſured, Theſe are the notes of the true Church: How can he poſſibly be a competent Judge, Which ſociety of Chriſtians hath title to theſe notes, and which hath not? Seeing this trial of neceſſity requires a great ſufficiency of knowledg of the monuments of Chriſtian Antiquity, which no unlearned man

can

can have, becauſe he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how ſhall he poſſibly be able to know whether the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetual Succeſſion of Viſible Profeſſors, which held alwayes the ſame Doctrin which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unleſs he hath firſt examined, what was the Doctrin of the Church in the firſt age, what in the ſecond, and ſo forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, than to ſtay at the firſt Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrine with the Doctrin of the firſt Age, every man of ordinary underſtanding may judge.

108. Let us imagine him advanc'd a ſtep farther, and to know which is the Church: how ſhall he know what that Church hath decreed, ſeeing the Church hath not been ſo careful in keeping of her decrees, but that many are loſt, and many corrupted? Beſides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers things, whether they be *De fide*, or not, how ſhall the unlearned do? Then for the ſenſe of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the underſtanding of them, than of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not ſuffer him to underſtand? Eſpecially, ſeeing the Decrees of divers Popes and Councels are conceived ſo obſcurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the ſenſe of them. And then they are written all in ſuch languages which the ignorant underſtand not, and therefore muſt of neceſſity rely herein, upon the uncertain and fallible authority of ſome particular men, who inform them that there is ſuch a Decree. And if the Decrees were tranſlated into Vulgar Languages, why the Tranſlators ſhould not be as infallible as you ſay the Tranſlators of Scripture are, who can poſſibly imagine?

109. Laſtly, how ſhall an unlearned man, or indeed any man, be aſſured of the certainty of that Decree, the certainty whereof depends upon ſuppoſitions which are impoſſible to be known whether they be true or no? For, it is not the Decree of a Councel, unleſs it be confirmed by a true Pope. Now the Pope cannot be a true Pope, if he came in by Simony: which whether he did or no, who can anſwer me? He cannot be a true Pope unleſs he were baptized, and baptized he was not, uuleſs the Miniſter had due Intention. So likewiſe he cannot be a true Pope, unleſſe he were rightly ordained Prieſt, and that again depends upon the Ordainer's ſecret Intention, and alſo upon his having the Epiſcopal Character. All which things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon ſo many uncertain ſuppoſitions, that no humane judgement can poſſibly be reſolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learnedſt man amongſt you all, no not the Pope himſelf, can, according to the grounds you go upon, have any certainty, that any Decree of any Councel is good and valid, and conſequently, not any aſſurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Councel.

110. *Ad §.* 20. If by a *private ſpirit*, you mean, a particular perſwaſion that a Doctrin is true, which ſome men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the Spirit of God: I ſay, to refer Controverſies to Scripture, is not to refer them to this kind of private Spirit. For is there not a manifeſt difference between ſaying, *The Spirit of God tels me that this is the meaning of ſuch a Text* (which no man can poſſibly know to be true, it being a ſecret thing) and between ſaying, *Theſe and theſe reaſons I have to ſhew, that this or that is true Doctrin, or that this or that is the meaning of ſuch a Scripture?* Reaſon being a Publique and certain thing, and expoſed to all mens tryal and examination,

examination. But now, if by *private ſpirit* you underſtand every mans particular Reaſon, then your firſt and ſecond inconvenience will preſently be reduced to one, and ſhortly to none at all.

111. *Ad §.* 20. And does not alſo giving the office of Judicature to the Church, come to conferr it upon every particular man? For, before any man believes the Church infallible, muſt he not have reaſon to induce him to believe it to be ſo? And, muſt he not judge of thoſe reaſons, whether they be indeed good and firm, or captious and ſophiſtical? Or, would you have all men believe all your Doctrin upon the Churches Infallibility, and the Churches Infallibility they know not why?

112. Secondly, ſuppoſing they are to be guided by the Church, they muſt uſe their own particular reaſon to find out which is the Church. And to that purpoſe, you your ſelves give a great many notes, which you pretend firſt to be Certain notes of the Church, and then to be Peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none elſe; but you do not ſo much as pretend, that either of thoſe pretences is evident of it ſelf, and therefore you go about to prove them both by reaſons; and thoſe reaſons, I hope, every particular man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for: that is, that theſe marks are indeed certain notes of the Church; and then, that your Church hath them, and no other.

113. One of theſe notes, indeed the only note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is Conformity with Antiquity; I mean, the moſt ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apoſtolique. Now, how is it poſſible any man ſhould examine your Church by this note, but he muſt by his own particular judgement, find out what was the Doctrin of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrin of the preſent Church, and be able to anſwer all theſe Arguments which are brought to prove repugnance between them? otherwiſe, he ſhall but pretend to make uſe of this note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no uſe of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the moſt of you do; not one in a hundered being able to give any tolerable reaſon for it. So that in ſtead of reducing them to particular reaſons, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance, and paſſion, and prejudice, and ſuch other wayes; which, if they lead one to the truth, they lead hundreds, nay thouſands to falſhood. But it is a pretty thing to conſider, how theſe men can blow hot and cold out of the ſame mouth to ſerve ſeveral purpoſes. Is there hope of gaining a Proſelyte? Then they will tell you, God hath given every man Reaſon to follow; and if the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch. That it is no good reaſon for a mans Religion, that he was born and brought up in it: For then a Turk ſhould have as much reaſon to be a Turk, as a Chriſtian to be a Chriſtian. That every man hath a judgment of Diſcretion; which if they will make uſe of, they ſhall eaſily find, that the true Church hath alwayes ſuch and ſuch marks, and that their Church hath them, and no other but theirs. But then if any of theirs be perſwaded to a ſincere and ſufficient tryal of their Church, even by their own notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed ſo conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their note is changed, You muſt not uſe your own reaſon, nor your judgement, but referr all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no reaſon for it, nay though they have evi-

dent

can have, becauſe he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how ſhall he poſſibly be able to know whether the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetual Succeſſion of Viſible Profeſſors, which held alwayes the ſame Doctrin which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unleſs he hath firſt examined, what was the Doctrin of the Church in the firſt age, what in the ſecond, and ſo forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, than to ſtay at the firſt Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrine with the Doctrin of the firſt Age, every man of ordinary underſtanding may judge.

108. Let us imagine him advanc'd a ſtep farther, and to know which is the Church: how ſhall he know what that Church hath decreed, ſeeing the Church hath not been ſo careful in keeping of her decrees, but that many are loſt, and many corrupted? Beſides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers things, whether they be *De fide*, or not, how ſhall the unlearned do? Then for the ſenſe of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the underſtanding of them, than of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not ſuffer him to underſtand? Eſpecially, ſeeing the Decrees of divers Popes and Councels are conceived ſo obſcurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the ſenſe of them. And then they are written all in ſuch languages which the ignorant underſtand not, and therefore muſt of neceſſity rely herein, upon the uncertain and fallible authority of ſome particular men, who inform them that there is ſuch a Decree. And if the Decrees were tranſlated into Vulgar Languages, why the Tranſlators ſhould not be as infallible as you ſay the Tranſlators of Scripture are, who can poſſibly imagine?

109. Laſtly, how ſhall an unlearned man, or indeed any man, be aſſured of the certainty of that Decree, the certainty whereof depends upon ſuppoſitions which are impoſſible to be known whether they be true or no? For, it is not the Decree of a Councel, unleſs it be confirmed by a true Pope. Now the Pope cannot be a true Pope, if he came in by Simony: which whether he did or no, who can anſwer me? He cannot be a true Pope unleſs he were baptized, and baptized he was not, uuleſs the Miniſter had due Intention. So likewiſe he cannot be a true Pope, unleſſe he were rightly ordained Prieſt, and that again depends upon the Ordainer's ſecret Intention, and alſo upon his having the Epiſcopal Character. All which things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon ſo many uncertain ſuppoſitions, that no humane judgement can poſſibly be reſolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learnedſt man amongſt you all, no not the Pope himſelf, can, according to the grounds you go upon, have any certainty, that any Decree of any Councel is good and valid, and conſequently, not any aſſurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Councel.

110. *Ad* §. 20. If by a *private ſpirit*, you mean, a particular perſwaſion that a Doctrin is true, which ſome men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the Spirit of God: I ſay, to refer Controverſies to Scripture, is not to refer them to this kind of private Spirit. For is there not a manifeſt difference between ſaying, *The Spirit of God tels me that this is the meaning of ſuch a Text* (which no man can poſſibly know to be true, it being a ſecret thing) and between ſaying, *Theſe and theſe reaſons I have to ſhew, that this or that is true Doctrin, or that this or that is the meaning of ſuch a Scripture?* Reaſon being a Publique and certain thing, and expoſed to all mens tryal and examination,

examination. But now, if by *private ſpirit* you underſtand every mans particular Reaſon, then your firſt and ſecond inconvenience will preſently be reduced to one, and ſhortly to none at all.

111. *Ad §.* 20. And does not alſo giving the office of Judicature to the Church, come to conferr it upon every particular man? For, before any man believes the Church infallible, muſt he not have reaſon to induce him to believe it to be ſo? And, muſt he not judge of thoſe reaſons, whether they be indeed good and firm, or captious and ſophiſtical? Or, would you have all men believe all your Doctrin upon the Churches Infallibility, and the Churches Infallibility they know not why?

112. Secondly, ſuppoſing they are to be guided by the Church, they muſt uſe their own particular reaſon to find out which is the Church. And to that purpoſe, you your ſelves give a great many notes, which you pretend firſt to be Certain notes of the Church, and then to be Peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none elſe; but you do not ſo much as pretend, that either of thoſe pretences is evident of it ſelf, and therefore you go about to prove them both by reaſons; and thoſe reaſons, I hope, every particular man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for: that is, that theſe marks are indeed certain notes of the Church; and then, that your Church hath them, and no other.

113. One of theſe notes, indeed the only note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is Conformity with Antiquity; I mean, the moſt ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apoſtolique. Now, how is it poſſible any man ſhould examine your Church by this note, but he muſt by his own particular judgement, find out what was the Doctrin of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrin of the preſent Church, and be able to anſwer all theſe Arguments which are brought to prove repugnance between them? otherwiſe, he ſhall but pretend to make uſe of this note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no uſe of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the moſt of you do; not one in a hundered being able to give any tolerable reaſon for it. So that in ſtead of reducing them to particular reaſons, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance, and paſſion, and prejudice, and ſuch other wayes; which, if they lead one to the truth, they lead hundreds, nay thouſands to falſhood. But it is a pretty thing to conſider, how theſe men can blow hot and cold out of the ſame mouth to ſerve ſeveral purpoſes. Is there hope of gaining a Proſelyte? Then they will tell you, God hath given every man Reaſon to follow; and if the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch. That it is no good reaſon for a mans Religion, that he was born and brought up in it: For then a Turk ſhould have as much reaſon to be a Turk, as a Chriſtian to be a Chriſtian. That every man hath a judgment of Diſcretion; which if they will make uſe of, they ſhall eaſily find, that the true Church hath alwayes ſuch and ſuch marks, and that their Church hath them, and no other but theirs. But then if any of theirs be perſwaded to a ſincere and ſufficient tryal of their Church, even by their own notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed ſo conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their note is changed, You muſt not uſe your own reaſon, nor your judgement, but referr all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no reaſon for it, nay though they have evi-

dent

dent reaſon to the contrary. For my part, I am certain that God hath given us our Reaſon, to diſcern between Truth and Falſhood, and he that makes not this uſe of it, but believes things he knows not why; I ſay, it is by chance that he believes the truth, and not by choice: and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of fools*.

114. But you that would not have men follow their Reaſon, what would you have them to follow? their Paſſion? Or pluck out their eyes and go blindfold? *No*, you ſay, *you would have them follow Authority*. On God's name let them; we alſo would have them follow Authority; for it is upon the Authority of Univerſal Tradition, that we would have them believe Scripture. But then as for the Authority which you would have them follow, you will let them ſee reaſon why they ſhould follow it. And is not this to go a little about? to leave Reaſon for a ſhort turn, and then to come to it again; and to do that which you condemn in others? It being indeed a plain impoſſibility for any man to ſubmit his reaſon but to Reaſon: for he that doth it to Authority, muſt of neceſſity think himſelf to have greater reaſon to believe that Authority. Therefore the confeſſion cited by *Breerely* you need not think to have been extorted from *Luther* and the reſt. It came very freely from them, and what they ſay, you practiſe as much as they.

115. And whereas you ſay that a *Proteſtant admits of Fathers, Councels, Church, as farr as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himſelf*: I ſay, you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it ſelf, but only ſo far as it agrees with your Church: and your Church you admit, becauſe you think you have reaſon to do ſo: ſo that by you as well as by Proteſtants all is finally reſolved into your own reaſon.

116 Nor do Heretiques only, but *Romiſh* Catholiques alſo, ſet up as many Judges, as there are men and women in the Chriſtian world. For do not your men and women judge your Religion to be true, before they believe it, as well as the men and women of other Religions? Oh but, you ſay, *They receive it, not becauſe they think it agreeable to Scripture, but becauſe the Church tels them ſo*. But then, I hope, they believe the Church, becauſe their own reaſon tels them they are to do ſo. So that the difference between a Papiſt and a Proteſtant is this, not that the one judges and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifeſt. *This ſame pernitious Doctrin is taught by* Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, *and others*. It is ſo, in very deed: But it is taught alſo by ſome others, whom you little think of. It is taught by S. *Paul*, where he ſayes, *Try all things, hold faſt that which is good*. It is taught by S. *John*, in theſe words, *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God or no*. It is taught by S. *Peter*, in theſe, *Be ye ready to render a reaſon of the hope that is in you*. Laſtly, this very pernitious Doctrin is taught by our *Saviour*, in theſe words, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch*. And, *Why of your ſelves judge you not what is right?* All which ſpeeches, if they do not adviſe men to make uſe of their Reaſon for the choice of their Religion, I muſt confeſs my ſelf to underſtand nothing. Laſtly, not to be infinite, it is taught by M. *Knot* himſelf, not in one page only, or chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very writing and publiſhing whereof, ſuppoſeth this for certain, that the Readers are to be Judges, whether his Reaſons which he brings, be ſtrong and convincing, of which ſort we have hitherto met with none: or elſe captious, or impertinences, as indifferent men ſhall (as I ſuppoſe) have cauſe to judge them. 117. But

117. But you demand, *What good Stateſmen would they be, who ſhould idæate, or fancy ſuch a Common-wealth, as theſe men have framed to themſelves a Church?* Truly if this be all the fault they have, that they ſay, *Every man is to uſe his own judgement in the choice of his Religion, and not to believe this or that ſenſe of Scripture, upon the bare Authority of any learned man or men, when he conceives he hath reaſons to the contrary, which are of more weight then their Authority*: I know no reaſon but, notwithſtanding all this, they might be as good Stateſmen as any of the Society. But what hath this to do with Common-wealths, where men are bound only to external obedience unto the Laws and Judgement of Courts, but not to an internal approbation of them, no nor to conceal their Judgement of them, if they diſapprove them? As if I conceived I had reaſon to miſlike the law of puniſhing ſimple theft with death, as Sr. *Thomas Moore* did, I might profeſs lawfully my judgment; and repreſent my Reaſons to the King or Common-wealth in a Parliament, as Sr. *Thomas Moore* did, without committing any fault, or fearing any puniſhment.

118. To the place of S. *Auſtin*, wherewith this Paragraph is concluded, I ſhall need give no other Reply, but only to deſire you to ſpeak like an honeſt man, and to ſay, Whether it be all one for a man, *to allow and diſallow in every Scripture what he pleaſes*, which is, either to daſh out of Scripture ſuch Texts or ſuch Chapters, becauſe they croſs his opinion? or to ſay (which is worſe,) *Though they be Scripture, they are not true?* Whether, I ſay, for a man thus to allow and diſallow in Scripture what he pleaſes, be all one, and no greater fault, than to allow that ſenſe of Scripture which he conceives to be true and genuine, and deduced out of the words, and to diſallow the contrary? For Gods ſake, Sir, tell me plainly; In thoſe Texts of Scripture, which you alledge for the Infallibility of your Church, do you not allow what ſenſe you think true, and diſallow the contrary? And do not you this, by the direction of your private reaſon? If you do, why do you condemn it in others? If you do not, I pray you tell me what direction you follow? or whether you follow none at all? If none at all, this is like drawing Lots, or throwing the Dice for the choice of a Religion. If any other, I beſeech you tell me what it is. Perhaps you will ſay, *the Churches Authority*; and that will be to dance finely in a round, thus, To believe the Churches infallible Authority, becauſe the Scriptures avouch it; and to believe that Scriptures ſay and mean ſo, becauſe they are ſo expounded by the Church. Is not this for a Father to beget his Son, and the Son to beget his Father? For a foundation to ſupport the houſe, and the houſe to ſupport the foundation? Would not *Campian* have cryed out at it, *Ecce quos gyros, quos Mæandros?* And to what end was this going about, when you might as well at firſt have concluded the Church infallible, becauſe ſhe ſayes ſo; as thus to put in Scripture for a meer ſtale, and to ſay the Church is infallible becauſe the Scripture ſayes ſo, and the Scripture means ſo, becauſe the Church ſayes ſo, which is infallible? Is it not moſt evident therefore to every intelligent man, that you are enforced of neceſſity to do that your ſelf, which ſo tragically you declaim againſt in others? The Church, you ſay, is infallible; I am very doubtful of it: How ſhall I know it? The Scripture you ſay, affirms it, as in the 59. of *Eſay*, *My ſpirit that is in thee, &c.* Well, I confeſs I find there theſe words: but I am ſtill doubtful, whether they be ſpoken of the Church of Chriſt: and if they be, whether they mean as you

pretend. You ſay, the Church ſaies ſo, which is infallible. Yea, but that is the Queſtion; and therefore not to be begg'd, but proved. Neither is it ſo evident as to need no proof: otherwiſe, why brought you this Text to prove it? Nor is it of ſuch a ſtrange quality, above all other Propoſitions, as to be able to prove it ſelf. What then remains but that you ſay, Reaſons drawn out of the Circumſtances of the Text, will evince that this is the ſenſe of it. Perhaps they will. But reaſons cannot convince me, unleſs I judge of them by my Reaſon; and, for every man or woman to rely on that, in the choice of their Religion, and in the interpreting of Scripture, you ſay, is a horrible abſurdity; and therefore muſt neither make uſe of your own in this matter, nor deſire me to make uſe of it.

119. But, *Univerſal Tradition* (you ſay, and ſo do I too) *is of it ſelf credible: and that hath, in all ages, taught the Churche's Infallibility with full conſent.* If it have, I am ready to believe it. But that it hath, I hope you would not have me take upon your word; for that were to build my ſelf upon the Church, and the Church upon You. Let then the Tradition appear; for a ſecret Tradition is ſomewhat like a ſilent Thunder. You will perhaps produce, for the confirmation of it, ſome ſayings of ſome Fathers, who in every Age taught this Doctrin; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronologie undertakes to do, but with ſo ill ſucceſs, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profeſs, that *in the firſt three Centuries, there was not one Authority pertinent*:) but how will you warrant that none of them teach the contrary? Again, how ſhall I be aſſured that the places have indeed this ſenſe in them? Seeing there is not one Father for 500. years after Chriſt, that does ſay in plain termes, *The Church of* Rome *is infallible*. What, ſhall we believe your Church that this is their meaning? But this will be again to go into the Circle, which made us giddy before; To prove the Church Infallible, becauſe Tradition ſaies ſo; Tradition to ſay ſo, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo; The Fathers to ſay ſo, becauſe the Church ſaies ſo, which is infallible. Yea, *but reaſon will ſhew this to be the meaning of them*. Yes, if we may uſe our Reaſon, and rely upon it. Otherwiſe, as light ſhews nothing to the blind, or to him that uſes not his eyes; ſo reaſon cannot prove any thing to him that either hath not, or uſeth not his reaſon to Judge of them.

120. Thus you have excluded your ſelf from all proof of your Churches Infallibility from Scripture or Tradition. And if you flie, laſtly, to Reaſon it ſelf for ſuccour, may not it juſtly ſay to you as *Iephte* ſaid to his Bretheren, *Ye have caſt me out and baniſhed me, and do you now come to me for ſuccour?* But if there be no certainty in Reaſon, how ſhall I be aſſured of the certainty of thoſe which you alledge for this purpoſe? Either I may judge of them, or not: If not, why do you propoſe them? If I may, why do you ſay I may not, and make it ſuch a monſtrous abſurdity, That men in the choice of their Religion ſhould make uſe of their Reaſon? which yet, without all queſtion, none but unreaſonable men can deny, to have been the chiefeſt end why Reaſon was given them.

121. *Ad §22. An Heretique he is* (ſaith D. Potter) *who oppoſeth any truth, which to be a divine revelation he is convinced in conſcience by any means whatſoever: Be it by a Preacher or Lay-man, be it by reading Scripture, or hearing them read.* And from hence you infer, that *he makes all theſe ſafe Propounders of Faith*. A moſt ſtrange and illogical deduction! For, may not a private man by evident reaſon convince another man, that ſuch

or

or ſuch a Doctrin is divine Revelation, and yet though he be a true Propounder in this point, yet propound another thing falſely, and without proof, and conſequently not be a ſafe Propounder in every point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propoſe to men divine Revelations, and do they not ſometimes convince men in conſcience, by evident proof from Scripture, that the things they ſpeak are divine Revelations? And whoſoever, being thus convinced, ſhould oppoſe this divine Revelation, ſhould he not be an Heretique, according to your own grounds, for calling Gods own Truth into queſtion? And would you think your ſelf well dealt with, if I ſhould collect from hence, that you make every Preacher a ſafe, that is, an infallible Propounder of Faith? Be the means of Propoſal what it will, ſufficient or inſufficient, worthy of credit or not worthy; though it were, if it it were poſſible, the barking of a Dog, or the chirping of a Bird, or were it the diſcourſe of the Devil himſelf, yet if I be, I will not ſay convinced but perſwaded, though falſly, that it is a divine Revelation, and ſhall deny to believe it I ſhall be a formal though not a material Heretique. For he that believes, though falſly, any thing to be a divine Revelation, and yet will not believe it to be true, muſt of neceſſity believe God to be falſe, which, according to your own Doctrin, is the formality of an Heretique.

122. And how it can be any way advantagious to Civil government, that men without warrant from God ſhould uſurp a Tyranny over other mens conſciences, and preſcribe unto them, without reaſon, and ſometime againſt reaſon, what they ſhall believe, you muſt ſhew us plainer if you deſire we ſhould believe. For to ſay, *Verily I do not ſee but that it muſt be ſo*, is no good demonſtration. For whereas you ſay, *That a man may be a paſſionate and ſeditious creature*, from whence you would have us inferr, that he may make uſe of his interpretation to ſatisfie his paſſion, and raiſe ſedition: There were ſome colour in this conſequence, if we (as you do) make private men infallible Interpreters for others; for then indeed they might lead Diſciples after them, and uſe them as inſtruments for their vile purpoſes. But when we ſay, they can only interpret for themſelves, what harme they can do by their paſſionate or ſeditious Interpretations, but only endanger both their temporal and eternal happineſs, I cannot imagine. For though we deny the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be an infallible Judge, yet we do not deny, but that there are Judges which may proceed with certainty enough againſt all ſeditious Perſons, ſuch as draw men to diſobedience either againſt Church or State, as well as againſt Rebels, and Traitors, and Theeves, and Murderers.

123. *Ad §.* 23. The next §. in the beginning argues thus: *For many ages there was no Scripture in the world: and for many more, there was none in many places of the world: yet men wanted not then and there ſome certain direction what to believe: Therefore there was then an infallible Judge.* Juſt as if I ſhould ſay, *York* is not my way from *Oxford* to *London*, therefore *Briſtol* is: Or, a Dog is not a horſe, therefore he is a man. As if God had no other waies of revealing himſelf to men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church.* S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Iſidorus Peluſiota* conceived, He might uſe other means. And Saint *Paul* telleth us that the *might be known by his works*; And that *they had the Law written in their hearts*. Either of theſe waies might make ſome faithful men, without either neceſſity of Scripture or Church.

* See *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 1 *in Mat. Iſidor. Peluſ. l.* 3. *ep.* 106 and alſo *Baſil. in Pſ.* 28. and then you ſhall confeſs, that by other means beſides theſe, God did communicate himſelf unto men, and made them receive and underſtand his laws: See alſo to the ſame purpoſe, *Heb.* 1. 1.

124. *But D.* Potter *ſayes*, you ſay, *In the Jewiſh Church there was a living Judge, indowed with an abſolute infallible direction in caſes of moment: as all points belonging to divine Faith are.* And where was that infallible direction in the Jewiſh Church when they ſhould have received Chriſt for their Meſſias, and refuſed him? Or perhaps this was not a caſe of moment. D. *Potter* indeed might ſay very well, not that the high Prieſt was infallible, (for certainly he was not) but that his determination was to be of neceſſity obeyed, though for the juſtice of it there was no neceſſity that it ſhould be believed. Beſides, it is one thing to ſay, that the living Judge in the Jewiſh Church had an infallible direction: another, that he was neceſſitated to follow this direction. This is the priviledge which you challenge. But it is that, not this, which the Doctor attributes to the Jews. As a man may truely ſay, the Wiſemen had an infallible direction to Chriſt, without ſaying or thinking that they were conſtrained to follow it, and could not do otherwiſe.

125. *But either the Church retains ſtill her Infallibility, or it was deveſted of it upon the receiving of Holy Scripture; which is abſurd.* An Argument me thinks like this, Either you have horns, or you have loſt them: but you never loſt them, therefore you have them ſtill. If you ſay, you never had horns; ſo, ſay I, for ought appears by your reaſons, the Church never had Infallibility.

126. *But ſome Scriptures were received in ſome places and not in others: therefore if Scriptures were the Judge of Controverſies, ſome Churches had one Judge and ſome another.* And what great inconvenience is there in that, that one part of *England* ſhould have one Judge, and another another? eſpecially ſeeing the Books of Scripture which were received by thoſe that received feweſt, had as much of the Doctrin of Chriſtianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel being contained in every one of the four Goſpels, as I have proved: So that they which had all the Books of the New Teſtament, had nothing ſuperfluous: For, it was not ſuperfluous but profitable, that the ſame thing ſhould be ſaid divers times, and be teſtified by divers witneſſes: And they that had but one of the four Goſpels wanted nothing neceſſary; and therefore it is vainly inferred by you, that *with months and years, as new Canonicall Scriptures grew to be publiſhed, the Church altered her rule of Faith and judge of Controverſies.*

127. *Hereſies*, you ſay, *would ariſe after the Apoſtles time, and after the writ ng of Scriptures: Theſe cannot be diſcovered, condemned, and avoided, unleſſe the Church be infallible; Therefore there muſt be a Church infallible.* But I pray tell me, Why cannot Hereſies be ſufficiently diſcovered, condemned and avoided, by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of Faith? If Scripture be ſufficient to inform us what is the Faith, it muſt of neceſſity be alſo ſufficient to teach us what is Hereſie: ſeeing Hereſie is nothing but a manifeſt deviation from, and an oppoſition to, the Faith. That which is ſtreight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifeſt the other. If any one ſhould deny, that there is a God; that this God is omnipotent, omniſcient, good, juſt, true, mercifull, a rewarder of them that ſeek him, a puniſher of them that obſtinately offend him; That Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World; that it is He, by obedience to whom men muſt look to be ſaved: If any man ſhould deny either his Birth, or Paſſion, or Reſurrection, or Aſcenſion, or Sitting at the

right

right hand of God: his having all power given him in Heaven and Earth: That it is he whom God hath appointed to be Judg of the quick & the dead: That all men ſhall riſe again at the laſt day: That they which believe and repent ſhall be ſaved: That they which do not believe or repent ſhall be damned: If a man ſhould hold that either the keeping of the *Moſaical* Law is neceſſary to Salvation: or that good works are not neceſſary to Salvation: In a word, if any man ſhould obſtinatly contradict the truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who does not ſee, that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a ſufficient means to diſcover, and condemn, and avoid that Hereſie without any need of an infallible guide? If you ſay, that *the obſcure places of Scripture contain matters of Faith*: I anſwer, that it is a matter of faith to believe that the ſenſe of them, whatſoever it is, which was intended by God, is true; for he that doth not do ſo calls Gods Truth into queſtion. But to believe this or that to be the true ſenſe of them, or, to believe the true ſenſe of them, and to avoid the falſe, is not neceſſary either to Faith or Salvation. For if God would have had his meaning in theſe places certainly known, how could it ſtand with his wiſdom, to be ſo wanting to his own will and end, as to ſpeak obſcurely? or how can it conſiſt with his Juſtice, to require of men to know certainly the meaning of thoſe words, which he himſelfe hath not revealed? Suppoſe there were an abſolute Monarch, that in his own abſence from one of his Kingdomes, had written Laws for the government of it, ſome very plainly, and ſome very ambiguouſly, and obſcurely, and his Subjects ſhould keep thoſe that were plainly written with all exactneſs, and for thoſe that were obſcure, uſe their beſt diligence to find his meaning in them, and obey them according to the ſenſe of them which they conceived; ſhould this King either with juſtice or wiſdom be offended with theſe Subjects, if, by reaſon of the obſcurity of them, they miſtook the ſenſe of them; and faild of performance, by reaſon of their errour?

128. But; *It is more uſeful and fit*, you ſay, *for the deciding of Controverſies, to have, beſides an infallible rule to go by, a living infallible Judge to determin them: and from hence* you *conclude, that certainly there is ſuch a Judge.* But why then may not another ſay, that it is yet more uſeful for many excellent purpoſes, that all the Patriarchs ſhould be infallible, than that the Pope only ſhould? Another, that it would be yet more uſeful, that all the Archbiſhops, of every Province ſhould be ſo, than that the Patriarchs only ſhould be ſo. Another, That it would be yet more uſeful, if all the Biſhops of every Dioceſe were ſo. Another, that it would be yet more available, that all the Parſons of every Pariſh ſhould be ſo. Another, that it would be yet more excellent, if all the Fathers of Families were ſo. And laſtly, another, that it were much more to be deſired that every Man and every Woman were ſo: juſt as much as the prevention of Controverſies, is better than the deciſion of them; and the prevention of Hereſies better then the condemnation of them; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very conſequence, That not only a general Councel, nor only the Pope, but all the Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Paſtors, Fathers, nay all the men in the world are infallible: If you ſay now, as I am ſure you will, that this Concluſion is moſt groſs, and abſurd, againſt ſenſe and experience, then muſt alſo the ground be falſe, from which it evidently and undeniably followes, *viz.* that that courſe of dealing with men ſeems alwayes more fit to Divine providence, which ſeems moſt fit to humane reaſon.

129. And so likewise, That there should men succeed the Apostles, which could shew themselves to be their successors, by doing of Miracles, by speaking all kind of languages, by delivering men to Satan, as S. *Paul* did *Hymenæus*, and the incestuous *Corinthian*; it is manifest in human reason, it were incomparably more fit and useful for the decision of Controversies, than that the successour of the Apostles should have none of these gifts, and for want of the signs of Apostleship, be justly questionable, whether he be his successour or no: and will you now conclude, That the Popes have the gift of doing Miracles, as well as the Apostles had?

130. It were in all reason very useful and requisite, that the Pope should, by the assistance of Gods Spirit, be freed from the vices and passions of men, lest otherwise, the Authority given him for the good of the Church, he might imploy (as divers Popes you well know have done) to the disturbance, and oppression, and mischief of it. And will you conclude from hence, That Popes are not subject to the sins and passions of other men? That there never have been ambitious, covetous, lustful, tyrannous Popes?

131. Who sees not that for mens direction it were much more beneficial for the Church, that Infallibility should be setled in the Popes Person, than in a General Councel: That so the means of deciding Controversies might be speedy, easie, and perpetual, whereas that of general Councels is not so. And will you hence infer, that not the Church Representative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Judg of Controversies? Certainly, if you should, the *Sorbon* Doctors would not think this a good Conclusion.

132. It had been very commodious (one would think) that seeing either Gods pleasure was, the Scripture should be translated, or else in his Providence he knew it would be so, that he had appointed some men for this business, and by his Spirit assisted them in it, that so we might have Translations as Authentical as the Original: yet you see God did not think fit to do so.

133. It had been very commodious (one would think) that the Scripture should have been, at least for all things necessary, a Rule, plain and perfect: and yet you say, it is both imperfect and obscure, even in things necessary.

134. It had been most requisite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles, should have been preserved free from variety of readings, which makes men very uncertain in many places, Which is the Word of God, and which is the Errour or presumption of man: and yet we see God hath not thought fit so to provide for us.

135. Who can conceive, but that an Apostolike Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have been strangely beneficial to the Church, especially there being such danger in mistaking the sense of them, as is by you pretended, and God in his Providence foreseeing that the greatest part of Christians, would not accept of the Pope for the Judge of Controversies? And yet we see God hath not so ordered the matter.

136. Who doth not see, that, supposing the Bishop of *Rome* had been appointed Head of the Church, and Judge of Controversies, that it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, that in some Book of Scripture which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Proposition had been set down in Terms, *The Bishops of* Rome *shall be alwayes Monarchs of the Church, and they either alone, or with their adherents, the Guides of Faith, and the Judges of Controversies that shall arise amongst Christians?* This, if you will deal ingenuously, you cannot but acknowledge;

acknowledge; for then all true Chriſtians would have ſubmitted to him, as willingly as to Chriſt himſelf, neither needed you and your Fellows have troubled your ſelf to invent ſo many Sophiſms for the proof of it. There would have been no more doubt of it among Chriſtians, than there is of the Nativity, Paſſion, Reſurrection, or Aſcenſion of Chriſt. You were beſt now rubb your forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that becauſe this would have been ſo uſeful to have been done, therefore it is done. Or if you be (as I know you are) too ingenuous to ſay ſo, then muſt you acknowledge, that the ground of your Argument, which is the very ground of all theſe abſurdities, is moſt abſurd; and that it is our duty to be humbly thankful for thoſe ſufficient, nay abundant means, of Salvation, which God hath of his own goodneſs granted us: and not conclude he hath done that which he hath not done, becauſe, forſooth, in our vain judgments, it ſeems convenient he ſhould have done ſo.

137. But you demand, *What repugnance there is betwixt infallibility in the Church, and exiſtence of Scripture, that the production of the one muſt be the deſtruction of the other?* Out of which words I can frame no other Argument for you than this; *There is no Repugnance between the Scripture's exiſtence, and the Churche's infallibility, therefore the Church is infallible.* Which conſequence will then be good, when you can ſhew that nothing can be untrue, but that only which is impoſſible; that whatſoever may be done, that alſo is done. Which, if it were true, would conclude both you and me to be infallible, as well as either your Church, or Pope: in as much as there is no more repugnance between the Scripture's exiſtence and our infallibility, than there is betwcen theirs.

138. *But, if Proteſtants will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them firſt produce ſome Scripture, affirming, that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church.* This Argument put in form, runs thus. No Scripture affirms, that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church: Therefore there is an infallible Church, and therefore the Scripture alone is not Judge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirms, that by the entring of it, Infallibility went out of the Church, ſo neither do we, neither have we any need to do ſo. But we ſay, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, ſo long as Chriſt and his Apoſtles were living, and then departed: God in his providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to ſupply the defect of living and infallible Guides. Certainly, if your cauſe were good, ſo great a Wit as yours is, would deviſe better Arguments to maintain it. We can ſhew no Scripture affirming Infallibility to have gone out of the Church, therefore it is Infallible. Somewhat like his diſcourſe that ſaid, It could not be proved out of Scripture, that the King of *Sweden* was dead, therefore he is ſtill living. Me-thinks in all reaſon, you that challenge priviledges, and exemption from the condition of Men, which is to be ſubject to errour; You that by vertue of this priviledge uſurp authority over mens conſciences, ſhould produce your Letters Patents from the King of Heaven, and ſhew ſome expreſs warrant for this Authority you take upon you, otherwiſe you know the rule is, *Ubi contrarium non manifeſtè probatur, præſumitur pro libertate.*

139. *But* D. Potter *may remember what himſelf teacheth, That the Church is ſtill endued with Infallibility in points Fundamental, and conſequently that Infallibility in the Church doth well agree with the Truth, the Sanctity, yea*

with

with the ſufficiency of Scripture, for all matters neceſſary to ſalvation. Still your diſcourſe is ſo far from hitting the White, that it roves quite beſides the Butt. You conclude, that the infallibility of the Church may well agree with the Truth, the Sanctity, the Sufficiency of Scripture. But what is this but to abuſe your Reader with the proof of that which no man denies? The Queſtion is not, Whether an infallible Church might agree with Scripture, but whether there be an Infallible Church? *Jam dic, Poſthume, de tribus Capellis.* Beſides, you muſt know, there is a wide difference between *being infallible in Fundamentals*, and being an *infallible Guide even in Fundamentals.* D. *Potter* ſays, that the Church is the former: that is, There ſhall be ſome men in the world, while the world laſts, which err not in Fundamentals; for otherwiſe there ſhould be no Church: For to ſay, the Church, while it is the Church, may err in Fundamentals, implies contradiction, and is all one as to ſay, The Church while it is the Church, may not be the Church. So that to ſay, that the Church is infallible in Fundamentals, ſignifies no more but this, There ſhall be a Church in the world for ever. But we utterly deny the Church to be the latter; for to ſay ſo, were to oblige our ſelves to find ſome certain Society of men, of whom we might be certain, that they neither do, nor can, err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is Fundamental, what is not Fundamental: and conſequently, to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes and requires to be believed. This therefore we deny both to your and all other Churches of any one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the *Abyſſine*: that is indeed, we deny it ſimply to any Church. For no Church can poſſibly be fit to be a Guide, but only a Church of ſome certain denomination. For otherwiſe no man can poſſibly know which is the true Church, but by a pre-examination of the Doctrine controverted, and that were, not to be guided by the Church to the true doctrin, but by the true doctrin to the Church. Hereafter therefore, when you hear Proteſtants ſay, The Church is Infallible in Fundamentals, you muſt not conceive them as if they meant, as you do, that ſome Society of Chriſtians, which may be known by adhering to ſome one Head, for example, the Pope, or the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, is infallible in theſe things: but only thus, That true Religion ſhall never be ſo far driven out of the world, but that it ſhall have always, ſome where or other, ſome that believe and profeſs it, in all things neceſſary to ſalvation.

140. But, *You would therefore gladly know out of what Text he imagines that the Church, by the coming of Scripture, was deprived of infallibility in ſome points, and not in others?* And I alſo would gladly know, Why you do thus frame to your ſelf vain imaginations, and then father them upon others? We yield unto you, That there ſhall be a Church which never erreth in ſome points, becauſe (as we conceive) God hath promiſed ſo much; but not, there ſhall be ſuch a Church which doth or can err in no points, becauſe we find not, that God hath promiſed ſuch a Church; and therefore we may not promiſe ſuch a one to our ſelves. But, for the Churches being deprived by the Scripture of Infallibility, in ſome points, and not in others, that is a wild notion of your own, which we have nothing to do with.

141. But he affirmeth, That *The Jewiſh Church retained Infallibility in her ſelf; and therefore it is unjuſtly, and unworthily done of him to deprive the Church of Chriſt of it.* That the Jews had ſometimes an infallible miraculous direction

direction from God in ſome caſes of moment, he doth affirm, and had good warrant: but that the Synagogue was abſolutely infallible, he no where affirms; and therefore it is unjuſtly and unworthily done of you to obtrude it upon him. And indeed how can the Infallibility of the Synagogue be conceived, but only by ſetling it in the High-Prieſt, and the company adhering and ſubordinate unto him? And whether the High-Prieſt was Infallible, when he believed not Chriſt to be the Meſſias, but condemned and excommunicated them that ſo profeſſed, and cauſed him to be crucified for ſaying ſo, I leave it to Chriſtians to judge. But then ſuppoſe God had been ſo pleaſed to do as he did not, to appoint the Synagogue an Infallible Guide: Could you by your rules of Logick conſtrain him to appoint ſuch an one to Chriſtians alſo; or ſay unto him, that in wiſdom he could not do otherwiſe? Vain man, that will be thus always tying God to your imaginations! It is well for us that he leaves us not without directions to him; but if he will do this ſometime by living Guides, ſometime by written Rules, What is that to you? May not he do what he will with his own?

142. *And whereas you ſay, for the further enforcing of this Argument, that there is greater reaſon to think the Church ſhould be infallible, than the Synagogue: becauſe to the Synaggoue all Laws and Ceremonies, &c. were more particularly, and minutely delivered, than in the new Teſtament is done; our Saviour leaving particulars to the determination of the Church.* But I pray walk not thus in generality, but tell us, what *particulars*? If you mean particular Rites and Ceremonies, and orders for government, we grant it, and you know we do ſo. Our Saviour only hath left a general injunction by S. *Paul, Let all things be done Decently, and in Order*. But what Order is fitteſt, i.e. what Time, what Place, what Manner, *&c.* is fitteſt, that he hath left to the diſcretion of the Governours of the Church. But, if you mean, that he hath only concerning matters of Faith, the ſubject in Queſtiſtion, preſcribed in general that we are to hear the Church, and left it to the Church to determine what particulars we are to believe, The Church being nothing elſe but an aggregation of Believers; this in effect is to ſay, He hath left it to all Believers to determine what Particulars they are to believe. Beſides, it is ſo apparently falſe, that I wonder you could content your ſelf, or think we ſhould be contented with a bare ſaying, without any ſhew or pretence of proof.

143. As for D. *Potter*'s Objection againſt this Argument, *That as well you might infer, that Chriſtians muſt have all one King, becauſe the Jews had ſo.* For ought I can perceive, notwithſtanding any thing anſwered by you, it may ſtand ſtill in force; though the truth is, it is urged by him not againſt the Infallibility but the Monarchy of the Church. For whereas you ſay, The diſparity is very clear: He that ſhould urge this Argument for one Monarch over the whole world, would ſay that this is to deny the Concluſion, and reply unto you, that there is diſparity as matters are now ordered, but that there ſhould not be ſo. For that there was no more reaſon to believe that the Eccleſiaſtical Government of the Jews was a Pattern for the Eccleſiaſtical Government of Chriſtians, than the Civil of the Jews, for the Civil of the Chriſtians. He would tell you, that the Church of Chriſt, and all Chriſtian Commonwealths, and Kingdoms, are one and the ſame thing: and therefore he ſees no reaſon why the Synagogue ſhould be a Type and Figure of the Church, and not of the Commonwealth;

monwealth. He would tell you, that as the Church ſucceeded the Jewiſh Synagogue, ſo Chriſtian Princes ſhould ſucceed to Jewiſh Magiſtrates: That is, the Temporal Governours of the Church ſhould be Chriſtians. He would tell you, that as the Church is compared to a Houſe, a Kingdom, an Army, a Body, ſo all diſtinct Kingdoms might and ſhould be one Army, one Family, *&c.* and that it is not ſo, is the thing he complains of. And therefore you ought not to think it enough to ſay, It is not ſo; but you ſhould ſhew, why it ſhould not be ſo; and why this Argument will not follow. The Jews had one King, therefore all Chriſtians ought to have: as well as this, The Jews had one High-Prieſt over them all, therefore all Chriſtians alſo ought to have. He might tell you moreover, that the Church may have one Maſter, one General, one Head, one King, and yet he not be the Pope, but Chriſt. He might tell you, that you beg the Queſtion, in ſaying without proof, that it is neceſſary to ſalvation, that all (whether Chriſtians or Churches) have recourſe to one Church, if you mean by one Church, one particular Church which is to govern and direct all others: and, that unleſs you mean ſo, you ſay nothing to the purpoſe. And beſides, he might tell you, and that very truly, that it may ſeem altogether as available for the Temporal good of Chriſtians to be under one Temporal Prince, or Commonwealth; as, for their ſalvation, to be ſubordinate to one Viſible Head. I ſay, as neceſſary, both for the prevention of the effuſion of the Blood of Chriſtians by Chriſtians, and for the defence of Chriſtendom, from the hoſtile invaſions of Turks, and Pagans. And from all this he might inferr, that though now, by the fault of men, there were in ſeveral Kingdoms, ſeveral Laws, Governments, and Powers; yet that it were much more expedient, that there were but one. Nay, not only expedient, but neceſſary; if once your ground be ſetled for a general Rule, that what kind of government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have. And, if you limit the generality of this Propoſition, and frame the Argument thus: What kind of Eccleſiaſtical government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have: But, They were governed by one High-Prieſt, Therefore, Theſe muſt be ſo: He will ſay, that the firſt Propoſition of this Syllogiſm, is altogether as doubtful as the Concluſion; and therefore neither fit nor ſufficient to prove it, until it ſelf be proved. And then beſides, that there is as great reaſon to believe this, That what kind of Civil government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have. And ſo D. *Potter*'s Objection remains ſtill unanſwered: That there is as much reaſon to conclude a neceſſity of one King over all Chriſtian Kingdoms, from the Jews having one King; as one Biſhop over all Churches, from their being under one High-Prieſt.

144. *Ad Q.* 24. Nether is this diſcourſe confirmed by *Irenæus* at all: Whether by this diſcourſe you mean that immediatly foregoing, of the Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, to which this ſpeech of *Irenæus*, alledged here by you, is utterly and plainly impertinent; Or whether by this diſcourſe, you mean (as I think you do) not your Diſcourſe, but your Concluſion which you diſcourſe on, that is, that *Your Church is the Infallible Judge in Controverſies*. For neither hath *Irenæus* one ſyllable to this purpoſe; neither can it be deduced out of what he ſays, with any colour of conſequence. For, firſt in ſaying, *What if the Apoſtles had not left Scripture, ought we not to have followed the order of Tradition?* And

in

in ſaying, *That to this order many Nations yield aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having Salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit of GOD, without Letters or Ink, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition:* Doth he not plainly ſhew, that the Tradition he ſpeaks of is nothing elſe, but the very ſame that is written: nothing but to believe in Chriſt? To which, whether Scripture alone, to them that believe it, be not a ſufficient guide, I leave it to you to judge. And are not his words juſt as if a man ſhould ſay, If God had not given us the light of the Sun, we muſt have made uſe of Candles and Torches: If we had no eyes, we muſt have felt out our way: If we had no legs, we muſt have uſed crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sun we need no Candles? While we have our eyes, we need not feel out our way? While we enjoy our legs, we need not crutches? And, by like reaſon, *Irenæus* in ſaying, *If we had no Scripture, we muſt have followed Tradition; and they that have none, do well to do ſo*; Doth he not plainly import, that to them that have Scripture and believe it, Tradition is unneceſſary? Which could not be, if the Scripture did not contain evidently the whole Tradition. Which, whether *Irenæus* believed or no, theſe words of his may inform you, *Non enim per alios*, &c. *we have received the diſpoſition of our Salvation from no others, but from them by whom the Goſpel came unto us. Which Goſpel truly the Apoſtles firſt preached, and afterwards by the will of God delivered in writing to us, to be the Pillar and Foundation of our Faith.* Upon which place, *Bellarmine's* two Obſervations, and his acknowledgment enſuing upon them are very conſiderable; and, as I conceive, as home to my purpoſe as I would wiſh them. His firſt *Notandum* is, *That, in the Chriſtian Doctrin, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary for the Salvation of all men; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtle's Creed; and beſides, the knowledge of the ten Commandments, and ſome of the Sacraments. Other things are not ſo neceſſary, but that a man may be ſaved without the explicit knowledge, and belief, and profeſſion of them.* His ſecond Note is, *That thoſe things, which were ſimply neceſſary, the Apoſtles were wont to preach to all men; But of other things not all to all; but, ſome things to all, to wit, thoſe things which were profitable for all; other things only, to Prelates and Prieſts.* Theſe things premiſed, he acknowledgeth, *That all theſe things were written by the Apoſtles which are neceſſary for all, and which they were wont openly to preach to all; But that other things were not all written: And therefore, when* Irenæus *ſays, that the Apoſtles wrote what they preached in the World, it is true,* ſaith he, *and not againſt Traditions, becauſe they preached not to the People all things, but only thoſe things which were neceſſary or profitable for them.*

145. So that at the moſt you can infer from hence but only a ſuppoſitive neceſſity of having an infallible Guide, and that grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition, in caſe, we had no Scripture: but, an abſolute neceſſity hereof, and to them who have and believe the Scripture, which is your Aſſumption, cannot with any colour from hence be concluded, but rather the contrary.

146. Neither becauſe (as He ſays) it was *then eaſie to receive the Truth from God's Church; then*, in the Age next after the Apoſtles, Then, when all the Ancient and Apoſtolique Churches were at an agreement about the Fundamentals of Faith: Will it therefore follow, that now, 1600 years after, when the ancient Churches are divided almoſt into as many Religi-

ons

ons as they are Churches, every one being the Church to it ſelf, and Heretical to all other, that it is as eaſie, but extreamly difficult or rather impoſſible, to find the Church firſt independently of the true Doctrin, and then to find the truth by the Church ?

147. As for the laſt clauſe of the ſentence, it will not any whit advantage, but rather prejudice your Aſſertion. Neither wil I ſeek to avoid the preſſure of it, by ſaying that he ſpeaks of *ſmall Queſtions*. and therefore not of Queſtions touching things neceſſary to Salvation, which can hardly be called ſmall Queſtions; But I will favour you ſo far, as to ſuppoſe, that ſaying this of ſmall Queſtions, it is probable he would have ſaid it much more of the Great: but I will anſwer that which is moſt certain and evident, and which I am confident you your ſelf, were you as impudent as I believe you modeſt, would not deny, That the Ancient Apoſtolique Churches are not now, as they were in *Irenæus* his time: then they were all at Unity about matters of Faith, which Unity was a good aſſurance that what they ſo agreed in, came from ſome one common Fountain, and that no other than of Apoſtolique Preaching. And this is the very ground of *Tertullian's* ſo often miſtaken *Preſcription againſt Heretiques: Variâſſe debuerat Error Eccleſiarum; quod autem apud multos unum eſt, non eſt erratum ſed traditum: If the Churches had erred, they could not but have varied; but that which is one among ſo many, came not by Error but Tradition.* But now the caſe is altered, and the miſchief is, that theſe ancient Churches are divided among themſelves; and if we have recourſe to them, one of them will ſay, This is the way to heaven, another that. So that now, in place of receiving from them certain and clear truths, we muſt expect nothing but certain and clear contradictions.

148. Neither will the *Apoſtle's depoſiting with the Church all things belonging to truth*, be any proof that the Church ſhall certainly keep this *depoſitum*, entire and ſincere, without adding to it, or taking from it; for this whole *depoſitum* was committed to every particular Church, nay, to every particular man which the Apoſtles converted. And yet no man, I think, will ſay that there was any certainty, that it ſhould be kept whole and inviolate by every man, and every Church. It is apparent out of Scripture it was committed to *Timothy*, and by him conſigned to other faithful men: and yet S. *Paul* thought it not ſuperfluous, earneſtly to exhort him to the careful keeping of it: which exhortation you muſt grant had been vain and ſuperfluous, if the not keeping of it had been impoſſible. And therefore though *Irenæus* ſays, *The Apoſtles fully depoſited in the Church all truth*, yet he ſays not, neither can we infer from what he ſays, That the Church ſhould always infallibly keep this *depoſitum*, entire, without the loſs of any truth, and ſincere without the mixture of any falſhood.

149. *Ad §.25.* But you proceed and tell us, *That, beſide all this, the Doctrine of Proteſtants is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to err in interpreting; or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible faith: If they have, and ſo cannot err in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with infallibility to hear and determine all Controverſies of Faith; and ſo they may be, and are, Judges of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a Rule. And thus againſt their own doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies beſide*

beſide Scripture alone. And may not we with as much reaſon ſubſtitute Church and Papiſts inſtead of Scripture and Proteſtants, and ſay unto you, Beſides all this, the doctrin of Papiſts is deſtructive of it ſelf? For either they have certain and infallible means not to err, in the choice of the Church, and interpreting her Decrees, or they have not: If not, then the Church to them cannot be a ſufficient (but meerly a phantaſtical) ground for infallible faith, nor a meet Judge of Controverſies: (For unleſs I be infallibly ſure that the Church is infallible, How can I be upon her Authority infallibly ſure, that any thing ſhe ſays is Infallible?) If they have certain infallible means, and ſo cannot err in the choice of their Church, and in interpreting her Decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to hear, examine, and determine all Controverſies of Faith, although they pretend to make the Church their Guide. And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies, beſides the Church alone. Nay every one makes himſelf a chuſer of his own Religion, and of his own ſenſe of the Churches Decree, which very thing in Proteſtants they ſo highly condemn: and ſo, in judging others, condemn themſelves.

150. Neither in ſaying thus have I only cried quittance with you: but that you may ſee how much you are in my debt, I will ſhew unto you that for your Sophiſm againſt our way, I have given you a Demonſtration againſt yours. Firſt, I ſay, your Argument againſt us is a tranſparent fallacy. The firſt Part of it lies thus: Proteſtants have no means to interpret, without Errour, obſcure and ambiguous places of Scripture; therefore plain places of Scripture cannot be to them a ſufficient ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain means of not erring in interpreting all Scripture, particularly ſuch places as are obſcure and ambiguous, yet this me-thinks, ſhould be no impediment but that we may have certain means of not erring in and about the ſenſe of thoſe places, which are ſo plain and clear that they need no Interpreters; and in ſuch we ſay our Faith is contained. If you ask me, How I can be ſure that I know the true meaning of theſe places? I ask you again, Can you be ſure, that you underſtand what I, or any man elſe ſays? They that heard our Saviour and the Apoſtles preach, could they have ſufficient aſſurance, that they underſtood at any time what they would have them do? If not, to what end did they hear them? If they could, Why may we not be as well aſſured that we underſtand ſufficiently what we conceive plain in their writings?

151. Again, I pray tell us, whether you do certainly know the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the knowledge of your Church? If you do not, How know you that there is any Church Infallible, and that theſe are the notes of it, and that this is the Church that hath theſe notes? If you do, then give us leave to have the ſame means, and the ſame abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know theſe. For, if all Scripture be obſcure, how come you to know the ſenſe of theſe places? If ſome places of it be plain, Why ſhould we ſtay here?

152. And now to come to the other part of your Dilemma; in ſaying, *If they have certain means, and ſo cannot err*, methinks you forget your ſelf very much, and ſeem to make no difference between having certain means to do a thing, and the actual doing of it. As if you ſhould con-

clude, becauſe all men have certain means of Salvation, therefore all men certainly muſt be ſaved, and cannot do otherwiſe; as if, Whoſoever had a horſe muſt preſently get up and ride; Whoſoever had means to find out a way, could not neglect thoſe means and ſo miſtake it. God be thanked that we have ſufficient means to be certain enough of the truth of our Faith: But the priviledge of not being in poſſibility of erring that we challenge not, becauſe we have as little reaſon as you to do ſo: and you have none at all. If you ask, ſeeing we may poſſibly err, How can we be aſſured we do not? I ask you again, ſeeing your eye-ſight may deceive you, How can you be ſure you ſee the Sun, when you do ſee it? Perhaps you may be in a dream, and perhaps you, and all the men in the World have been ſo, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake, when they thought they dreamt. But this I am ſure of, as ſure as that God is good, that he will require no impoſſibilities of us: not an Infallible, nor a certainly-unerring belief, unleſs he hath given us certain means to avoid error; and, if we uſe thoſe which we have, will never require of us, that we uſe that which we have not.

153. Now from this miſtaken ground, That it is all one to have means of avoiding error, and to be in no danger nor poſſibility of error; You infer upon us an abſurd Concluſion, *That we make our ſelves able to determine Controverſies of Faith with Infallibility, and Judges of Controverſies.* For the latter part of this Inference, we acknowledge and embrace it. We do make our ſelves Judges of Controverſies, that is, we do make uſe of our own underſtanding in the choice of our Religion. But this, if it be a crime, is common to us with you, (as I have proved above) and the difference is, not that we are chuſers, and you not chuſers, but that, we, as we conceive, chuſe wiſely, but you, being willfully blind, chuſe to follow thoſe that are ſo too; not remembring what our Saviour hath told you, *When the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* But then again I muſt tell you, You have done ill to confound together, *Judges*, and *Infallible Judges*; unleſs you will ſay, either that we have no Judges in our Courts of Civil Judicature, or that they are all Infallible.

154. Thus have we caſt off your *Dilemma*, and broken both the horns of it. But now my retortion lies heavy upon you, and will not be turned off. For firſt you content not your ſelves with a moral certainty of the things you believe, nor with ſuch a degree of aſſurance of them, as is ſufficient to produce obedience to the condition of the new Covenant, which is all that we require. God's Spirit, if he pleaſe, may work more, a certainty of adherence beyond a certainty of evidence: But neither God doth, nor man may, require of us as our duty, to give a greater aſſent to the concluſion, than the premiſſes deſerve; to build an Infallible Faith upon Motives that are only highly credible, and not infallible, as it were a great and heavy building upon a foundation that hath not ſtrength proportionable. But though God require not of us ſuch unreaſonable things, You do; and tell men, They cannot be ſaved, unleſs they believe your Propoſals with an infallible Faith. To which end they muſt believe alſo your Propounder, your Church to be ſimply Infallible. Now how is it poſſible for them to give a rational aſſent to the Churches infallibility, unleſs they have ſome infallible means to know that ſhe is infallible? Neither can they infallibly know the infallibility of this means, but by ſome other, and ſo on for ever:

ever: unleſs they can dig ſo deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to ſettle all upon ſomething evident of it ſelf*, which is not ſo much as pretended. But the laſt reſolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon examination will ſcarce appear probable, but are not ſo much as avouched to be any more than very credible. For example, if I ask you, Why you do believe Tranſubſtantiation? What can you anſwer, but becauſe it is a Revelation of the Prime Verity. I demand again, How can you aſſure your ſelf or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appear to be ſo? And what can you ſay, but that you know it to be ſo, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible? If I ask, What mean you by your Church? You can tell me nothing but the company of Chriſtians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demand then further: Why ſhould I believe this company to be the infallible Propounder of Divine Revelation? And then you tell me, that there are many Motives to induce a man to this belief. But are theſe Motives laſtly infallible? No ſay you, but very credible. Well, let them paſs for ſuch, becauſe now we have not leiſure to examine them. Yet me-thinks ſeeing the Motives to believe the Churches infallibility are only very credible, it ſhould alſo be but as credible that your Church is Infallible; and as credible, and no more, perhaps ſomewhat leſs, that her propoſals, particularly Tranſubſtantiation, are Divine Revelations. And me-thinks you ſhould require only a Moral, and modeſt aſſent to them, and not a Divine, as you call it, and infallible Faith. But then of theſe Motives to the Churches Infallibility, I hope you will give us leave to conſider, and judge whether they be indeed Motives, and ſufficient; or whether they be not Motives at all, or not ſufficient; or whether theſe Motives or inducements to your Church be not impeached, and oppoſed with Compulſives and enforcements from it; or laſtly, Whether theſe Motives which You uſe, be not indeed only Motives to Chriſtianity, and not to *Popery*: give me leave for diſtinction-ſake to call your Religion ſo. If we may not judge of theſe things, How can my judgment be moved with that which comes not within its cognizance? If I may, then at leaſt I am to be a Judg of all theſe Controverſies. 1. Whether every one of theſe Motives be indeed a Motive to any Church? 2. If to ſome, whether to Yours? 3. If to Yours, whether ſufficient, or inſufficient? 4. Whether other Societies have not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them? 5. Whether I have not greater reaſon to believe you do err, than that you cannot? And now Sir, I pray let me trouble You with a few more Queſtions. Am I a ſufficient Judge of theſe Controverſies, or no? If of theſe, why ſhall I ſtay here, why not of others? Why not of all? Nay, doth not the true examining of theſe few contain and lay upon me the examination of all? What other Motives to your Church have you, but your Notes of it? *Bellarmine* gives ſome 14. or 15. And one of theſe fifteen contains in it the examination of all Controverſies; and not only ſo, but of all uncontroverted Doctrines. For how ſhall I, or can I, *know the Church of* Rome's *conformity with the Ancient Church*, unleſs I know firſt what the Ancient Church did hold, and then what the Church of *Rome* doth hold; and laſtly, whether they be conformable, or, if in my judgment they ſeem not conformable, I am then to think the Church of *Rome* not to be the Church, for want of the Note which ſhe pretends, is proper, and perpetual to it. So that, for ought I can ſee, Judges we are, and muſt be of all ſides; every one for himſelf, and God for us all.

155. *Ad Q.* 26. I anſwer; This Aſſertion, that *Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith*, if it be taken properly, is neither a Fundamental nor Unfundamental point of Faith, nor no point of Faith at all, but a plain falſhood. It is not a *Judge of Controverſies, but a Rule to judge them by*; and that not an abſolutely perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which muſt always need ſomething elſe, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible, to give atteſtation to it, and that in this caſe is Univerſal Tradition. So that Univerſal Tradition is the Rule to judge all Controverſies by. But then becauſe nothing, beſides Scripture, comes to us with as full a ſtream of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrin, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having atteſtation from Tradition truly Univerſal; for this reaſon we conceive, as the Apoſtles perſons while they were living were the only Judges of Controverſies, ſo their Writings, now they are dead, are the only Rule for us to judge them by; There being nothing unwritten, which can go in upon half ſo fair eards, for the Title of Apoſtolike Tradition, as theſe things, which by the confeſſion of both Sides are not ſo: I mean *the Doctrine of the Millenaries*, and *of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants*.

156. Yet when we ſay, The Scripture is the only Rule to judge all Controverſies by; me-thinks you ſhould eaſily conceive, that we would be underſtood, of all thoſe that are poſſible to be judged by Scripture, and of thoſe that ariſe among ſuch as believe the Scripture. For, if I had a Controverſie with an Atheiſt whether there were a God or no, I would not ſay, that the Scripture were a Rule to judge this by; ſeeing that, doubting whether there be a God or no, he muſt needs doubt whether the Scripture be the Word of God: or, if he does not, he grants the Queſtion, and is not the man we ſpeak of. So likewiſe, if I had a Controverſie about the Truth of Chriſt with a Jew, it would be vainly done of me, ſhould I preſs him with the Authority of the New Teſtament which he believes not, until out of ſome principles common to us both, I had perſwaded him that it is the Word of God. The New Teſtament therefore, while he remains a Jew, would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controverſie; in as much as that which is doubted of it ſelf, is not fit to determine other doubts. So likewiſe, if there were any that believed Chriſtian Religion, and yet believed not the Bible to be the Word of God, though they believed the matter of it to be true, (which is no impoſſible ſuppoſition; for I may believe a Book of S. *Auſtin*'s to contain nothing but the Truth of God, and yet not to have been inſpired by God himſelf,) againſt ſuch men therefore there were no diſputing out of the Bible; becauſe nothing in queſtion can be a proof to it ſelf. When therefore we ſay, Scripture is a ſufficient means to determine all Controverſies, we ſay not this, either to Atheiſts, Jews, Turks, or ſuch Chriſtians (if there be any ſuch) as believe not Scripture to be the Word of God. But among ſuch men only, as are already agreed upon this, that *the Scripture is the Word of God*, we ſay, All Controverſies that ariſe about Faith, are either not at all decidable, and conſequently not neceſſary to be believed one way or other; or they may be determined by Scripture. In a word, That all things neceſſary to be believed are evidently contained in Scripture, and what is not there evidently contained, cannot be neceſſary to be believed. And our reaſon hereof is convincing, becauſe nothing can challenge our belief, but what hath deſcended to

us

us from Chriſt by Original and Univerſal Tradition: Now nothing but Scripture hath thus deſcended to us, Therefore nothing but Scripture can challenge our belief. Now then to come up cloſer to you, and to anſwer to your Queſtion, not as you put it, but as you ſhould have put it: I ſay, That this Poſition, *Scripture alone is the Rule whereby they which believe it to be God's Word, are to judge all Controverſies in Faith*, is no fundamental point, Though not for your Reaſons: For, your firſt and ſtrongeſt reaſon, you ſee, is plainly voided and cut off by my ſtating of the Queſtion as I have done, and ſuppoſing in it, that the parties at variance, are agreed about this, That the Scripture is the Word of God; and conſequently that this is none of their Controverſies. To your ſecond, That *Controverſies cannot be ended without ſome livtng Authority*, We have ſaid already, that Neceſſary Controverſies may be and are decided. And, if they be not ended, this is not through defect of the Rule, but through the default of Men. And, for theſe that cannot thus be ended, it is not neceſſary they ſhould be ended. For, if God did require the ending of them, he would have provided ſome certain means for the ending of them. And, to your Third, I ſay, that Your pretence of *uſing theſe means*, is but hypocritical; for you uſe them with prejudice, and with a ſetled reſolution not to believe any thing which theſe means happily may ſuggeſt into you, if it any way croſs your pre-conceived perſwaſion of your Churche's Infallibility. You give not your ſelves liberty of judgment in the uſe of them, nor ſuffer your ſelves to be led by them to the Truth, to which they would lead you, would you but be as willing to believe this Conſequence, Our Church doth oppoſe Scripture, therefore it doth err, therefore it is not infallible; as you are reſolute to believe this, The Church is infallible, therefore it doth not err, and therefore it doth not oppoſe Scripture, though it ſeem to do ſo never ſo plainly.

157. *You pray*, but it is not that God would bring you to the true Religion, but that he would confirm you in your own. *You conferr places*, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plauſible diſguiſes your erroneous doctrin, not that you may judge of them, and forſake them, if there be reaſon for it. *You conſult the Originals*, but you regard them not when they make againſt your Doctrin or Tranſlation.

158. You add not only the Authority, but the Infallibility, not of God's Church, but of the *Roman*, a very corrupt and degenerous part of it: whereof. D. *Potter* never confeſſed, that it cannot err damnably. And which being a company made up of particular men, can afford you no help, but the induſtry, learning, and wit of private men: and, that theſe helps may not help you out of your errour, tell you, that you muſt make uſe of none of all theſe to diſcover any error in the Church, but only to maintain her impoſſibility of erring. And laſtly, D. *Potter* aſſures himſelf that your Doctrine and Practices are damnable enough in themſelves; Only he hopes (and *ſpes eſt rei incertæ nomen*) he hopes, I ſay, that the Truths which you retain, eſpecially the neceſſity of repentance and faith in Chriſt, will be as an Antidote to you againſt the errors which you maintain; and that your ſuperſtruction may burn, yet they amongſt you, *qui ſequuntur Abſalonem in ſimplicitate cordis*, may be ſaved, *yet ſo as by fire*. Yet his thinking ſo, is no reaſon for you or me to think ſo, unleſs you ſuppoſe him infallible; and, if you do, Why do you write againſt him?

159. Notwithſtanding, though not for theſe reaſons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrine not Fundamental: Becauſe, if a man ſhould believe Chriſtian Religion wholely, and entirely, and live according to it, ſuch a man, though he ſhould not know or not believe the Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, no nor to be the Word of God, my opinion is, he may be ſaved; and my reaſon is, becauſe he performs the entire condition of the new Covenant, which is, that we believe the matter of the Goſpel, and not that it is contained in theſe or theſe Books. So that the Books of Scripture are not ſo much the Objects of our faith, as the inſtruments of conveying it to our underſtanding; and not ſo much of the being of the Chriſtian Doctrin, as requiſite to the wel-being of it. *Irenæus* tells us (as *M. K.* acknowledgeth) of ſome barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrine of Chriſt, and yet believed not the Scripture to be the Word of God; for they never heard of it, and Faith comes by hearing:* But theſe barbarous people might be ſaved: Therefore men might be ſaved without believing the Scripture to be the Word of God; much more without believing it to be a Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the Books of Scripture had been propoſed to them by the other parts of the Church, where they had been before received, and had been doubted of, or even rejected by thoſe barbarous Nations, but ſtill by the bare belief and practice of Chriſtianity, they might be ſaved; God requiring of us under pain of damnation, only to believe the verities therein contained, and not the divine Authority of the Books wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very ſtrange and unreaſonable, if a man ſhould believe the matter of theſe Books, and not the Authority of the Books: and therefore, if a man ſhould profeſs the not-believing of theſe, I ſhould have reaſon to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal neceſſity for the belief of thoſe things, for the belief whereof there is an equal reaſon. We have, I believe, as great reaſon to believe there was ſuch a man as *Henry* the eighth King of *England*, as that *Jeſus Chriſt* ſuffered under *Pontius Pilate:* yet this is neceſſary to be believed, and that is not ſo. So that, if any man ſhould doubt of or d sbelieve that, it were moſt unreaſonably done of him, yet it were no mortal ſin, nor no ſin at all: God having no where commanded men under pain of damnation to believe all which reaſon induceth them to believe. Therefore as an Executor, that ſhould perform the whole will of the dead, ſhould fully ſatisfie the Law, though he did not believe that Parchment to be his written Will, which indeed is ſo: So I believe, that he, who believes all the particular Doctrines which integrate Chriſtianity, and lives according to them, ſhould be ſaved, though he neither believed nor knew that the Goſpels were written by the Evangeliſts, or the Epiſtles by the Apoſtles.

160. This diſourſe, whether it be rational, and concluding or no, I ſubmit to better judgment; but ſure I am, that the Corollary, which you draw from this Poſition, *that this Point is not Fundamental*, is very inconſequent; that is, *that we are uncertain of the truth of it*, becauſe we ſay, The whole Church, much more particular Churches and private men may err in points not Fundamental. A pretty ſophiſm, depending upon this Principle, that whoſoever poſſibly may err, he cannot be certain that he doth not err. And upon this ground, what ſhall hinder me from concluding, that ſeeing you alſo hold, that neither particular Churches, nor private men are

in-

infallible even in Fundamentals, that even the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, remain to you uncertain? A Judge may poſſibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have aſſurance that he hath judged right? A Traveller may poſſibly miſtake his way, muſt I therefore be doubtful whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our *London*-Carrier have no certainty, in the middle of the day, when he is ſober and in his wits, that he is in the way to *London?* Theſe, you ſee, are right worthy conſequences, and yet they are as like your own, as an egg to an egg, or milk to milk.

161. And, *for the ſelf ſame reaſon* (you ſay) *we are not certain, that the Church is not Judge of Controverſies:* But now this ſelf ſame appears to be no reaſon; and therefore, for all this, we may be certain enough that the Church is no Judge of Controverſies. The ground of this ſophiſm is very like the former, *viz.* that we can be certain of the falſhood of no propoſitions, but theſe only which are damnable errors. But, I pray good Sir, give me your opinion of theſe: The Snow is black, the Fire is cold, that M. *Knot* is Arch-Biſhop of *Toledo*, that the whole is not greater than a part of the whole, that twice two make not four: In your opinion, good Sir, are theſe damnable Hereſies? Or, becauſe they are not ſo, have we no certainty of the falſhood of them? I beſeech you Sir, to conſider ſeriouſly, with what ſtrange captions you have gone about to delude your King and your Country; and, if you be convinced they are ſo, give glory to God, and let the world know it by your deſerting that Religion, which ſtands upon ſuch deceitful foundations.

162. Beſides (you ſay) *among publique Concluſions defended in* Oxford, *the year* 1633. *to the Queſtions, Whether the Church have Authority to determine Controverſies of Faith? And to interpret holy Scripture? The Anſwer to both is affirmative.* But what now if I ſhould tell you, that, in the year 1632. among publique Concluſions defended in *Doway*, one was, *That God predeterminates men to all their actions, good, bad, and indifferent?* Will you think your ſelf obliged to be of this opinion? If you will, ſay ſo: If not, do as you would be done by. Again, me-thinks, ſo ſubtil a man as you are, ſhould eaſily apprehend a wide difference between Authority to do a thing, and Infallibility in doing it: and again, between a Conditional Infallibility and an Abſolute. The former, the Doctor, together with the Article of the Church of *England*, attributeth to the Church, nay to particular Churches; and I ſubſcribe to his opinion; that is, an Authority of determining Controverſies of Faith, according to plain and evident Scripture and Univerſal Tradition; and Infallibility while they proceed according to this Rule. As if there ſhould ariſe an Heretique, that ſhould call in queſtion Chriſt's Paſſion and Reſurrection, the Church had Authority to decide this Controverſie, and infallible direction how to do it, and to excommunicate this man, if he ſhould perſiſt in error. I hope, you will not deny but that the Judges have Authority to determine Criminal and Civil Controverſies; and yet, I hope, you will not ſay, that they are abſolutely infallible in their determination. Infallible while they proceed according to Law, and if they do ſo: but not infallibly certain that they ſhall ever do ſo. But that the Church ſhould be infallibly aſſiſted by God's Spirit to decide rightly all emergent Controverſies, even ſuch as might be held diverſly of divers men, *Salva compage fidei*, and that we might be abſolutely certain

that

that the Church ſhould never fail to decree the truth, whether ſhe uſed means or no, whether ſhe proceed according to her Rule or not; or laſtly, that we might be abſolutely certain that ſhe would never fail to proceed according to her Rule, this the Defender of theſe Concluſions ſaid not: and therefore ſaid no more to your purpoſe, than you have all this while, that is, juſt nothing.

163. *Ad* §. 27. To the place of S. *Auſtin* alledged in this Paragraph, I Anſwer, Firſt, that in many things you will not be tried by S. *Auguſtin*'s judgement, nor ſubmit to his Authority; not concerning Appeals to *Rome*, not concerning Tranſubſtantiation, not touching the uſe and worſhipping of Images, not concerning the State of Saint's ſouls before the day of Judgment, not touching the Virgin *Marie*'s freedom from actual and original ſin, not touching the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, not touching the damning Infants to hell that die without Baptiſm, not touching the knowledge of Saints departed, not touching Purgatory, not touching the fallibility of Councels, even general Councels; not touching perfection and perſpicuity of Scripture in matters neceſſary to Salvation, not touching Auricular Confeſſion, not touching the half-Communion, not touching prayers in an unknown tongue; In theſe things, I ſay, you will not ſtand to S. *Auſtin*'s judgment, and therefore can with no reaſon or equity require us to do ſo in this matter. 2. To S. *Auguſtine* in heat of diſputation againſt the Donatiſts, and ranſacking all places for Arguments againſt them, we oppoſe S. *Auſtin* out of this heat, delivering the Doctrine of Chriſtianity calmly and moderately; where he ſays, *In iis quæ aperiè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moreſque vivendi.* 3. We ſay, he ſpeaks not of the *Roman* but the Catholike Church, of far greater extent, and therefore of far greater credit and authority than the *Roman* Church. 4. He ſpeaks of a point not expreſſed, but yet not contradicted by Scripture; whereas the errors we charge you with, are contradicted by Scripture. 5. He ſays not that Chriſt hath recommended the Church to us for *an infallible definer of all emergent Controverſies*, but for a *credible witneſs of ancient Tradition*. Whoſoever therefore refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church (underſtand *of all places and ages*) though he be thought to reſiſt our Saviour, what is that to us, who caſt off no practices of the Church, but ſuch as are evidently poſt-nate to the time of the Apoſtles, and plainly contrary to the practice of former and purer times. Laſtly, it is evident, and even to Impudence it ſelf undeniable, that upon this ground, *of believing all things taught by the preſent Church as taught by Chriſt*, Error was held; for example, *the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants*, and that in S. *Auſtin*'s time, and that by S. *Auſtin* himſelf: and therefore without controverſie this is no certain ground for truth, which may ſupport falſhood as well as truth.

164. To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I anſwer, That though the Viſible Church ſhall always without fail propoſe ſo much of God's Revelation, as is ſufficient to bring men to Heaven, for otherwiſe it will not be the viſible Church; yet it may ſometimes add to this revelation things ſuperfluous, nay, hurtful, nay in themſelves damnable, though not unpardonable; and ſometimes take from it things very expedient and profitable; and therefore it is poſſible, without ſin, to reſiſt in ſome things the Viſible Church of Chriſt. But you preſs us farther, and demand, *What viſible*

viſible Church was extant, when Luther *began, whether it were the* Roman *or Proteſtant Church?* As if, it muſt of neceſſity either be Proteſtant or *Roman*; or *Roman* of neceſſity, if it were not Proteſtant. Yet this is the moſt uſual fallacy of all your Diſputers, by ſome ſpecious Arguments to perſwade weak men, that the Church of Proteſtants cannot be the true Church; and thence to inferr, that without doubt it muſt be the *Roman*. But why may not the *Roman* be content to be a part of it, and the Grecian another? And if one muſt be the whole, why not the Greek Church, as well as the *Roman*? there being not one Note of your Church which agrees not to her as well as to your own; unleſs it be, that ſhe is poor, and oppreſſed by the Turk, and you are in glory and ſplendor.

165. Neither is it ſo eaſie to be determined as you pretend, *That* Luther *and other Proteſtants oppoſed the whole viſible Church in matters of Faith*; neither is it ſo evident, that *the Viſible Church may not fall into ſuch a ſtate wherein ſhe may be juſtly oppoſed.* And laſtly, for calling the diſtinction of *points* into *Fundamental and not Fundamental*, an Evaſion, I believe, you will find it eaſier to call it ſo, than to prove it ſo. But that ſhall be the iſſue of the Controverſie in the next Chapter.

CHAP. III.

That the diſtinction of Points Fundamental and not Fundamental, is neither pertinent, nor true in our preſent Controverſie. And that the Catholique Viſible Church cannot err, in either kind of the ſaid Points.

THis diſtinction is abuſed by Proteſtants to many purpoſes of theirs; and therefore if it be either untrue or impertinent (as they underſtand, and apply it) the whole edifice built thereon, muſt be ruinous and falſe. For, if you object their bitter and continued diſcords in matters of Faith, without any means of agreement: they inſtantly tell you (as *Charity Miſtaken* plainly ſhews) that they differ only in Points not-Fundamental. If you convince them, even by their own Confeſſions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers Points held by the *Roman* Church againſt Proteſtants: they reply, that thoſe Fathers may nevertheleſs be ſaved, becauſe thoſe errors were not Fundamental. If you will them to remember, that Chriſt muſt alwayes have a Viſible Church on earth, with adminiſtration of Sacraments, and ſucceſſion of Paſtors, and that when *Luther* appeared there was no Church diſtinct from the *Roman*, whoſe *Communion* and *Doctrine*, *Luther* then forſook, and for that cauſe muſt be guilty of *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*: they have an Anſwer (ſuch as it is) that the Catholique Church cannot periſh, yet may err in Points not Fundamental, and therefore *Luther* and other Proteſtants were obliged to forſake her for ſuch errors, under pain of *Damnation*: as if (forſooth) it were *Damnable*, to hold an error not-*Fundamental*, nor *Damnable*. If you wonder how they can teach, that both Catholiques and Proteſtants may be ſaved in their ſeveral Profeſſions: they ſalve this contradiction, by ſaying, that we both agree in all Fundamental Points of Faith, which is enough for ſalvation. And yet, which is prodigiouſly ſtrange, they could never be induced to give a Catalogue what Points in particular be Fundamental, but only by ſome general deſcription, or by referring us to the *Apoſtles Creed*, without determining, what Points therein be Fundamental, or not Fundamental for the matter: and in what ſenſe they be, or be not, ſuch: And yet concerning the meaning of divers Points contained, or reduced to the *Creed*, they differ both from us, and among themſelves. And indeed, it being impoſſible for them to exhibit any ſuch Catalogue, the ſaid diſtinction of Points, although it were pertinent and true, cannot ſerve them to any purpoſe, but ſtill they muſt remain uncertain, whether or not they diſagree from one another, from the ancient Fathers, and from the Catholique Church, in Points Fundamental: which is to ſay, they have no certainty whether they enjoy the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Faith, without which they cannot hope to be ſaved. But of this more hereafter.

2. And to the end, that what ſhall be ſaid concerning this diſtinction may be better underſtood, we are to obſerve, that there be two precepts which concern the vertue of Faith, or our obligation to *believe* divine Truths. The one is by Divines called *Affirmative*, whereby we are obliged to have a poſitive explicit belief of ſome chief Articles of Chriſtian Faith. The other is termed *Negative*, which ſtrictly binds us not to disbelieve, that is, not to believe the contrary of any one Point ſufficiently repreſented to our underſtandings, as revealed or ſpoken by Almighty God. The ſaid *Affirmative Precept* (according to the nature of ſuch commands) injoyns ſome Act to be performed but not at all *times*, nor doth it equally bind all ſorts of *perſons*, in reſpect of all *Objects* to be believed. For *Objects*; we grant

grant that ſome are more neceſſary to be explicitely, and ſeverally believed than other: either becauſe they are in themſelves more great, and weighty; or elſe in regard they inſtruct us in ſome neceſſary Chriſtian duty towards God, our Selves, or our Neighbour. For *Perſons*; no doubt but ſome are obliged to know diſtinctly more than others, by reaſon of their office, vocation, capacity, or the like. For *Times*; we are not obliged to be ſtill in act of exerciſing acts of Faith, but according as ſeveral occaſions permit, or require. The ſecond kind of Precept called *Negative*, doth (according to the nature of all ſuch commands) oblige *univerſally*, all *Perſons*, in reſpect of all *Objects*; and at all *Times*; *ſemper & pro ſemper*, as Divines ſpeak. This general Doctrin will be more clear by Examples. I am not obliged to be always helping my Neighbour, becauſe the *Affirmative* Precept of *Charity* bindeth only in ſome particular caſes: But I am always bound by a *Negative* Precept, never to do him any hurt, or wrong. I am not always bound to utter what I know to be true: yet I am obliged, never to ſpeak any one leaſt untruth, againſt my knowledge. And (to come to our preſent purpoſe) there is no *Affirmative* Precept, commanding us to be at *all times* actually believing any *one*, or *all* Articles of Faith: But we are obliged, *never* to exerciſe any act againſt any one truth, known to be revealed. All ſorts of *Perſons* are not bound explicitely and diſtinctly to know all things teſtified by God either in Scripture, or otherwiſe: but every one is obliged, not to believe the contrary of any one Point, known to be teſtified by God. For that were in fact to affirm, that God could be deceived, or would deceive, which were to overthrow the whole certainty of our Faith, wherein the thing moſt principal, is not the Point which we believe, which Divines call the *Material Object*, but the chiefeſt is the *Motive* for which we believe, to wit, Almighty God's infallible Revelation, or Authority, which they term the *Formal Object* of our Faith. In two ſenſes therefore, and with a double relation, Points of Faith may be called Fundamental, and neceſſary to Salvation: The one is taken with reference to the *Affirmative* Precept, when the Points are of ſuch quality that there is obligation to know and believe them explicitely and ſeverally. In this ſenſe we grant that there is difference betwixt Points of Faith, which D. *Potter* (a) to no purpoſe laboureth to prove againſt his Adverſary, who in expreſs words doth grant and explicate (b) it. But the *Doctor* thought good to diſſemble the matter, and not to ſay one pertinent word in defence of his diſtinction, as it was impugned by *Charity Miſtaken*, and as it is wont to be applyed by Proteſtants. The other ſenſe, according to which Points of Faith may be called *Fundamental*, and neceſſary to Salvation with reference to the *Negative* Precept of Faith, is ſuch, that we cannot without grievous ſin, and forfeiture of Salvation disbelieve any one Point, ſufficiently propounded, as revealed by Almighty God. And in this ſenſe we avouch, that there is no diſtinction in Points of Faith, as if to reject ſome muſt be damnable, and to reject others, equally propoſed as God's Word, might ſtand with Salvation. Yea, the obligation of the *Negative* Precept is far more ſtrict, than is that of the *Affirmative*, which God freely impoſed, and may freely releaſe. But it is impoſſible, that he can diſpenſe, or give leave to disbelieve, or deny what he affirmeth; and in this ſenſe ſin and damnation are more inſeparable from *Error* in Points *not Fundamental*, than from *Ignorance* in Articles *Fundamental*. All this I ſhew by an example, which I wiſh to be particularly noted for the preſent, and for divers other occaſions hereafter. The *Creed* of the *Apoſtles* contains divers Fundamental Points of Faith, as the Deity, Trinity of Perſons, Incarnation, Paſſion, and Reſurrection of our Saviour Chriſt, *&c.* It contains alſo ſome Points, for their matter, and nature in themſelves not Fundamental; as under what Judge our Saviour ſuffered, that he was buried, the circumſtance of the time of his Reſurrection the third day, *&c.* But yet nevertheleſs, whoſoever once knows that theſe Points are contained in the Apoſtles *Creed*, the denial of them is damnable, and is in that ſenſe a *Fundamental* error: and this is the preciſe Point of the preſent queſtion.

(a) *Pag.* 209.
(b) Charity Miſtaken, c. 8. *pag.* 75.

3. And all that hitherto hath been ſaid, is ſo manifeſtly true, that no Proteſtant or Chriſtian, if he do but underſtand the terms, and ſtate of the queſtion, can poſſibly deny it: In ſo much as I am amazed, that men who otherwiſe are indued with excellent wits, ſhould ſo enſlave themſelves to their Predeceſſors in Proteſtantiſm, as ſtill to harp on this diſtinction, and never regard how impertinently, and untruly it was implyed by them at firſt, to make all Proteſtants ſeem to be of one Faith, becauſe forſooth they agree in Fundamental Points. For the difference among Proteſtants, conſiſts not in that ſome believe ſome Points, of which others are ignorant, or not bound expreſsly to know (as the diſtinction ought to be applyed;) but that ſome of them disbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppoſe what others do believe to be teſtified by the Word of God, wherein there is no difference between Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental; Becauſe, till Points Fundamental be ſufficiently propoſed as revealed by God, it is not againſt Faith to reject them, or rather without ſufficient propoſition it is not poſſible prudently to believe them; and the like is of Points not-Fundamental, which as ſoon as they come to be ſufficiently propounded as divine Truths, they can no more be denied, than Points Fundamental propounded after the ſame manner. Neither will it avail them to their other end, that, for preſervation of the Church in being, it is ſufficient that ſhe do not err in Points Fundamental. For, if in the mean time ſhe maintain any one Error againſt Gods revelation, be the thing in it ſelf never ſo ſmall, her Error is damnable and deſtructive of Salvation.

4. But D. *Potter* forgetting to what purpoſe Proteſtants make uſe of their diſtinction, doth finally overthrow it, and yields to as much as we can deſire. For ſpeaking of that *meaſure* (c) *and quantity of Faith without which none can be ſaved*, he ſaith: *It is enough to believe ſome things by a vertual Faith, or by a general, and, as it were, a negative Faith, whereby they are not denied or contradicted.* Now our queſtion is in caſe that divine Truths, although not Fundamental, be denied and contradicted; and therefore, even according to him, all ſuch denial excludes Salvation. After, he ſpeaks more plainly. *It is true* (ſaith he) *whatſoever* (d) *is revealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in ſome ſenſe Fundamental, in regard of the divine authority of God, and his Word, by which it is recommended: that is, ſuch as may not be denied, or contradicted without Infidelity: ſuch as every Chriſtian*

(c) *Pag.* 211.
(d) *Pag.* 212.

Christian is bound, with humility, and reverence to believe, whensoever the knowledge thereof is offered to him. And further: *where* (e) *the revealed Will or Word of God is sufficiently propounded; there he that oppoſeth, is convinced of Error, and he, who is thus convinced, is an Heretick, and Hereſie is a work of the fleſh which excludeth from heaven,* (Gal. 5. 20, 21.) *And hence it followeth, that it is* FUNDAMENTAL *to a Chriſtian's* FAITH, *and neceſſary for his Salvation, that he believe all revealed Truths of God, whereof he may be convinced that they are from God.* Can any thing be ſpoken more clearly or directly for us, that it is a *Fundamental* Error to deny any one Point, though never ſo ſmall, if once it be ſufficiently propounded as a divine Truth, and that there is in this ſenſe, no diſtinction betwixt Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental? And if any ſhould chance to imagine, that it is againſt the foundation of Faith, not to believe Points *Fundamental*, although they be not ſufficiently propounded, D. *Potter* doth not admit of this (f) difference betwixt Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental. For he teacheth, that *ſufficient propoſition of revealed Truth is required before a man can be convinced*, and for want of ſufficient conviction he excuſeth the Diſciples from Hereſie, although they believed not our Saviour's Reſurrection, (g) which is a very Fundamental Point of Faith. Thus then I argue out of D. *Potter's* own confeſſion: No error is damnable unleſs the contrary Truth be ſufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Every Error is damnable, if the contrary Truth be ſufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Therefore all Errors are alike for the general effect of damnation, if the difference ariſe not from the manner of being propounded. And what now is become of their diſtinction?

(e) *Pag.* 250.

(f) *Pag.* 246.

(g) *Pag* 246.

5. I will therefore conclude with this Argument. According to all Philoſophy and Divinity, *the unity*, and diſtinction of every thing followeth the Nature and Eſſence thereof; and therefore, if the *Nature* and *Being* of Faith, be not taken from the matter which a man believes, but from the motive for which he believes, (which is God's Word or Revelation) we muſt likewiſe affirm that the *unity* and *Diverſity* of Faith, muſt be meaſured by God's Revelation (which is alike for all objects) and not by the ſmalneſs, or greatneſs of the matter which we believe. Now, that the nature of Faith is not taken from the greatneſs, or ſmalneſs of the things believed, is manifeſt; becauſe otherwiſe one who believes only Fundamental Points, and another, who together with them, doth alſo believe Points not Fundamental, ſhould have Faith of different natures, yea there ſhould be as many differences of Faith, as there are different Points which men believe, according to different capacities or inſtructions, *&c.* all which conſequences are abſurd, and therefore we muſt ſay, that *unity in Faith* doth not depend upon Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental, but upon Gods Revelation equally or unequally propoſed: and Proteſtants pretending an *unity* only by reaſon of their agreement in Fundamental Points, do indeed induce as great a multiplicity of Faith as there is multitude of different objects which are believed by them, and ſince they diſagree in things *Equally revealed* by Almighty God, it is evident that they forſake the very *Formal motive* of Faith, which is God's revelation, and conſequently loſe all *Faith*, and *unity* therein.

6. The firſt part of the Title of this Chapter (*That the diſtinction of Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental in the ſenſe of Proteſtants, is both impertinent and untrue*) being demonſtrated; let us now come to the ſecond: *That the Church is infallible in all her definitions, whether they concern Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental.* And this I prove by theſe reaſons.

7. It hath been ſhewed in the precedent Chapter, that the Church is Judge of Controverſies; which ſhe could not be, if ſhe could err in any one Point; as D. *Potter* would not deny, if he were once perſwaded that ſhe is Judge. Becauſe, if ſhe could err in ſome Points, we could not relie upon her *Authority* and Judgement in any one thing.

8. This ſame is proved by the reaſon we alledged before, that ſeeing the Church was infallible in all her definitions ere Scripture was written (unleſs we will take away all certainty of Faith for that time) we cannot with any ſhew of reaſon affirm, that ſhe hath been deprived thereof by the adjoyned comfort, and help of Sacred Writ.

9. Moreover, to ſay that the Catholique Church may propoſe any falſe Doctrin, maketh her liable to *damnable* ſin and error; and yet D. *Potter* teacheth that the Church cannot err *damnably*. For if in that kind of Oath, which Divines call *Aſſertorium*, wherein God is called to witneſs, every falſhood is a deadly ſin in any private perſon whatſoever, although the thing be of it ſelf neither material, nor prejudicial to any; becauſe the quantity or greatneſs of that ſin is not meaſured ſo much by the thing which is affirmed, as by the manner, and authority whereby it is avouched, and by the injury that is offered to Almighty God in applying his teſtimony to a falſhood: in which reſpect it is the unanimous conſent of all Divines, that in ſuch kind of Oaths, no *levitas materiæ*, that is, *ſmalneſs of matter*, can excuſe from a moral ſacrilege, againſt the moral vertue of Religion, which reſpects worſhip due to God: If, I ſay, every leaſt falſhood be deadly ſin in the foreſaid kind of Oath, much more pernicious a ſin muſt it be in the *publique perſon* of the Catholique Church to propound untrue Articles of Faith, thereby faſtning God's *prime Verity* to a falſhood, and inducing, and obliging the world to do the ſame. Beſides, according to the Doctrin of all Divines, it is not only injurious to God's Eternal Verity, to disbelieve things by him revealed, but alſo to propoſe as revealed Truths, things not revealed: as in Commonwealths it is a hainous offence to coyn either by counterfeiting, the metal or the ſtamp, or to apply the King's Seal to a writing counterfeit, although the contents were ſuppoſed to be true. And whereas to ſhew the deteſtable ſin of ſuch pernitious fictions, the Church doth moſt exemplarly puniſh all broachers of feigned revelations, viſions, miracles, prophecies, *&c.* as in particular appeareth in the Councel of (h) *Lateran*, excommunicating ſuch perſons; if the Church her ſelf could propoſe falſe revelations, ſhe her ſelf ſhould have been the firſt, and chiefeſt deſerver to have been cenſured, and, as it were, excommunicated by her ſelf. For (as the holy Ghoſt ſaith in (i) *Job, Doth God need your lye, that for him you may ſpeak deceits?* And that of the *Apocalyps* is moſt truly verified in fictious revelations: *If any* (k) *ſhall add to theſe things,*

(h) *Sub Leon.* 10. *Seſſ.* 11.

(i) *Cap.* 13. *v.* 7.

(k) *Cap. ult. v.* 18.

God

(l) Pag. 122. *God will add unto him the plagues which are written in this Book* : and D. *Potter* ſaith, *to add* (l) *to it* (ſpeaking of the Creed) *is high preſumption, almoſt as great as to detract from it.* And therefore to ſay the Church may add falſe revelations, is, to accuſe her of high preſumption, and of pernitious error excluding Salvation.

10. Perhaps ſome will here reply, that although the Church may err, yet it is not imputed to her for ſin, by reaſon ſhe doth not err upon malice or wittingly, but by ignorance, or miſtake.

11. But it is eaſily demonſtrated that this excuſe cannot ſerve. For, if the Church be aſſiſted only for Points Fundamental, ſhe cannot but know, that ſhe may err in Points not Fundamental, at leaſt ſhe cannot be certain that ſhe cannot err, and therefore cannot be excuſed from headlong and pernitious temerity, in propoſing Points not Fundamental, to be believed by Chriſtians, as matters of Faith, wherein ſhe can have no certainty, yea which always imply a falſhood. For although the thing might chance to be true, and perhaps alſo revealed; yet, for the *matter*, ſhe for her part, doth always expoſe her ſelf to danger of falſhood and error; and in fact doth always err in the *manner* in which ſhe doth propound any matter not Fundamental; becauſe ſhe propoſeth it as a Point of Faith *certainly* true, which yet is always uncertain, if ſhe in ſuch things may be deceived.

12. Beſides, if the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, ſhe may err in propoſing ſome Scripture for Canonical, which is not ſuch: or elſe err in not keeping and conſerving from corruptions ſuch Scriptures as are already believed to be Canonical. For I will ſuppoſe, that in ſuch Apocryphal Scripture as ſhe delivers, there is no Fundamental Error againſt Faith, or that there is no falſhood at all, but only want of Divine teſtification: in which caſe D. *Potter* muſt either grant that it is a Fundamental Error to apply Divine revelation to any Point not revealed, or elſe muſt yield, that the Church may err in her *Propoſition*, or *Cuſtody* of the Canon of Scripture: and ſo we cannot be ſure whether ſhe hath not been deceived already, in Books recommended by her, and accepted by Chriſtians. And thus we ſhall have no certainty of Scripture, if the Church want certainty in all her definitions. And it is worthy to be obſerved, that ſome Books of Scripture which were not alwayes known to be Canonical, have been afterward received for ſuch; but never any one Book or ſyllable defined by the Church to be Canonical, was afterward queſtioned, or rejected for Apocryphal. A ſign, that God's Church is infallibly aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt, never to propoſe as Divine truth, any thing not revealed by God: and that, *Omiſſion* to define Points not ſufficiently diſcuſſed is laudable, but *Commiſſion* in propounding things not revealed, inexcuſable; into which precipitation our Saviour Chriſt never hath, nor never will, permit his Church to fall.

13. Nay, to limit the general promiſes of our Saviour Chriſt made to his Church to Points only Fundamental, namely, that *the gates* (m) *of hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*: and that *the holy Ghoſt* (n) *ſhall lead her into all Truth*, &c. is to deſtroy all Faith. For we may by that Doctrine, and manner of interpreting the Scripture, limit the Infallibility of the Apoſtles words, and preaching, only to Points Fundamental: and whatſoever general Texts of Scripture ſhall be alledged for their infallibility, they may by D. *Potter*'s example be explicated, and reſtrained to Points Fundamental. By the ſame reaſon it may be farther affirmed, that the Apoſtles, and other Writers of Canonical Scripture, were indued with infallibility, only in ſetting down Points Fundamental. For, if it be urged, that *all Scripture is divinely inſpired*; that it is the Word of God, &c. D. *Potter* hath afforded you a ready anſwer, to ſay, that *Scripture is inſpired*, &c. only in thoſe parts, or parcels, wherein it delivereth Fundamental Points. In this manner D. *Fotherby* ſaith: *The Apoſtle* (o) *twice in one Chapter profeſſed, that this he ſpeaketh, and not the Lord; He is very well content that where he lacks the warrant of the expreſs Word of God, that part of his writings ſhould be eſteemed as the word of man.* D. *Potter* alſo ſpeaks very dangerouſly towards this purpoſe, *Sect.* 5. where he endeavoureth to prove, that the infallibility of the Church is limited to Points Fundamental, becauſe *as Nature, ſo God is neither defective in* (p) *neceſſaries, nor laviſh in ſuperfluities.* Which reaſon doth likewiſe prove that the infallibility of Scripture, and of the Apoſtles muſt be reſtrained to Points neceſſary to Salvation, that ſo God be not accuſed, *as defective in* (p) *neceſſaries, or laviſh in ſuperfluities.* In the ſame place he hath a diſcourſe much tending to this purpoſe, where ſpeaking of theſe words: *The Spirit ſhall lead you into all Truth, and ſhall abide with* (q) *you for ever*, he ſaith: *Though that promiſe was* (r) *directly, and primarily made to the Apoſtles (who had the Spirit's guidance in a more high and abſolute manner than any ſince them) yet it was made to them for the behoof of the Church, and is verified in the Church univerſal. But all truth is not ſimply all, but all of ſome kind. To be lead into all truths, is to know and believe them And who is ſo ſimple, as to be ignorant, that there are many millions of Truths (in Nature, Hiſtory, Divinity) whereof the Church is ſimply ignorant? How many Truths lie unrevealed in the infinite Treaſury of God's wiſdom, wherewith the Church is not acquainted, &c? So then, the Truth it ſelf enforceth us to underſtand by (all Truths) not ſimply all, not all which God can poſſibly reveal, but all pertaining to the ſubſtance of Faith, all Truth abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* Mark what he ſaith. That promiſe *(The Spirit ſhall lead you into all Truth) was made directly to the Apoſtles, and is verified in the univerſal Church, but by all Truth is not underſtood ſimply all, but all appertaining to the ſubſtance of Faith, and abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* Doth it not hence follow, that the promiſe made to the Apoſtles of being lead into all Truth, is to be underſtood only of all Truth abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation? and conſequently their preaching, and writing were not infallible in Points not Fundamental? or, if the Apoſtles were infallible in all things which they propoſed as divine Truth, the like muſt be affirmed of the Church, becauſe D. *Potter* teacheth, the ſaid promiſe *to be verified in the Church.* And as he limits the aforeſaid words to Points Fundamental; ſo may he reſtrain, what other Text ſoever, that can be brought for the univerſal infallibility of the Apoſtles or Scriptures. So he may; and ſo he muſt, leſt otherwiſe he receive this anſwer of his own from himſelf, *How many Truths lie unrevealed in the infinite Treaſury of God's wiſdom, wherewith the Church is not acquainted?* And therefore to verifie ſuch general ſayings, they muſt be underſtood of Truths abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. Are not theſe fearful conſequences? And yet D. *Potter* will never be

(m) Mat. 16. 18.
(n) Joan. 16. 13.
(o) In his Sermons. Serm. 2. pag. 50.
(p) Pag. 150.
(q) Joan. c. 16. 13. & c. 14. 16.
(r) Pag. 151, 152.

be able to avoid them, till he come to acknowledge the infallibility of the Church in all Points by her propoſed as divine Truths; and thus it is univerſally true that ſhe is lead into all Truth, in regard that our Saviour never permits her to define, or teach any falſhood.

14. All, that with any colour may be replyed to this Argument, is; That, if once we call any one Book, or parcel of Scripture in queſtion; although for the matter it contain no Fundamental error, yet it is of great importance and Fundamental, by reaſon of the conſequence; becauſe, if once we doubt of one Book received for Canonical, the whole Canon is made doubtful and uncertain, and therefore the infallibility of Scripture muſt be univerſal, and not confined within compaſs of Points Fundamental.

15. I anſwer: For the thing it ſelf it is very true, that if I doubt of any one parcel of Scripture received for ſuch, I may doubt of all: and thence by the ſame parity I infer, that, if we did doubt of the Churches infallibility in ſome Points, we could not believe her in any one, and conſequently not in propounding *Canonical* Books, or any other Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental; which thing being moſt abſurd, and withal moſt impious, we muſt take away the ground thereof, and believe that ſhe cannot err in any Point great or ſmall: and ſo this reply doth much more ſtrengthen what we intend to prove. Yet I add, that Proteſtants cannot make uſe of this reply with any good coherence to this their diſtinction, and ſome other Doctrines which they defend. For, if D. *Potter* can tell what Points in particular be Fundamental (as in his 7. *Sect.* he pretendeth) then he might be ſure, that whenſoever he meets with ſuch Points in Scripture, in them, it is infallibly *true*, although it may err in others: and not only *true* but *clear*, becauſe Proteſtants teach, that, in matters neceſſary to Salvation, the Scripture is ſo clear, that all ſuch neceſſary Truths are either manifeſtly contained therein, or may be clearly deduced from it. Which Doctrines being put together, to wit: That Scriptures cannot err in Points Fundamental; that they clearly contain all ſuch Points; and that they can tell what Points in particular be ſuch, I mean Fundamental; it is manifeſt, that it is ſufficient for Salvation, that Scripture be infallible only in Points Fundamental. For ſuppoſing theſe Doctrines of theirs to be true, they may be ſure to find in Scripture all Points neceſſary to Salvation, although it were fallible in other Points of leſs moment. Neither will they be able to avoid this impiety againſt holy Scripture, till they renounce their other Doctrines, and in particular, till they believe that Chriſt's promiſes to his Church, are not limited to Points Fundamental.

16. Beſides, from the fallibility of Chriſt's Catholique Church in ſome Points, it followeth, that no true Proteſtant, learned or unlearned, doth or can with aſſurance believe the univerſal Church in any one Point of Doctrine. Not in Points of leſſer moment, which they call *not-Fundamental*; becauſe they believe that in ſuch Points ſhe may err. Not in *Fundamental*; becauſe they muſt know what Points be Fundamental, before they go to learn of her, leſt otherwiſe they be rather deluded, than inſtructed; in regard that her certain, and infallible direction extends only to Points Fundamental. Now, if before they addreſs themſelves to the Church, they muſt know what Points are Fundamental, they learn not of her, but will be as fit to teach, as to be taught by her: How then are all Chriſtians ſo often, ſo ſeriouſly, upon ſo dreadful menaces, by Fathers, Scriptures, and our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, counſelled and commanded to ſeek, to hear, to obey the Church? S. *Auſtin* was of a very different mind from Proteſtants: *If* (ſaith he) *the* (s) *Church through the whole world practiſe any of theſe things, to diſpute whether that ought to be ſo done, is a moſt inſolent madneſs.* And in another place he ſaith, *That which* (t) *the whole Church holds, and is not ordained by Councels, but hath always been kept, is moſt rightly believed to be delivered by Apoſtolical Authority.* The ſame holy Father teacheth, that the cuſtom of baptizing children cannot be proved by Scripture alone, and yet that it is to be believed, as derived from the Apoſtles. *The cuſtom of our Mother the* (u) *Church* (ſaith he) *in baptizing Infants is in no wiſe to be contemned, nor to be accounted ſuperfluous, nor is it at all to be believed, unleſs it were an Apoſtolical Tradition.* And elſewhere. *Chriſt* (w) *is of profit to Children baptized, Is he therefore of profit to perſons not believing? But, God forbid, that I ſhould ſay, Infants do not believe. I have already ſaid, he believes in another, who ſinned in another. It is ſaid, he believes, and it is of force, and he is reckoned among the faithful that are baptized. This the authority of our Mother the Church hath; againſt this ſtrength, againſt this invincible wall whoſoever ruſheth ſhall be cruſhed in pieces.* To this argument the Proteſtants in the Conference at *Ratisbon*, gave this round Anſwer: *Nos ab* Auguſtino (x) *hac in parte libere diſſentimus. In this we plainly diſagree from* Auguſtin. Now, if this Doctrine of baptizing Infants be not Fundamental in D. *Potter's* ſenſe, then according to S. *Auguſtine*, the infallibility of the Church extends to Points not Fundamental. But if on the other ſide it be a Fundamental Point; then, according to the ſame holy *Doctor*, we muſt relie on the authority of the Church for ſome Fundamental Point not contained in Scripture, but delivered by Tradition. The like argument I frame out of the ſame Father about the not re-baptizing of thoſe who were baptized by Heretiques, whereof he excellently to our preſent purpoſe ſpeaketh in this manner. *We follow* (y) *indeed in this matter even the moſt certain authority of Canonical Scriptures.* But how? conſider his words: *Although verily there be brought no example for this Point out of the Canonical Scriptures, yet even in this Point the truth of the ſame Scriptures is held by us, while we do that, which the authority of Scriptures doth recommend, that ſo, becauſe the holy Scripture cannot deceive us, whoſoever is afraid to be deceived by the obſcurity of this queſtion, muſt have recourſe to the ſame Church concerning it, which without any ambiguity the holy Scripture doth demonſtrate to us.* Among many other Points in the aforeſaid words, we are to obſerve, that, according to this holy Father, when we prove ſome Points not particularly contained in Scripture, by the authority of the Church, even in that caſe we ought not to be ſaid to believe ſuch Points without Scripture, becauſe Scripture it ſelf recommends the Church; and therefore relying on her, we relie on Scripture, without danger of being deceived by the obſcurity of any queſtion defined by the Church. And elſewhere he ſaith, *Seeing this is* (z) *written in no Scripture, we muſt believe the teſtimony of the Church, which Chriſt declareth to ſpeak the truth.* But it ſeems D. *Potter* is of opinion that this

(s) *Epiſt.* 118.

(t) *Lib.* 4. *de Bapt. cap.* 24.

(u) *Lib.* 10. *de Geneſi ad liter. cap.* 23.

(w) *Serm.* 14. *de verbis Apoſt. cap.* 18.

(x) *See proto-col. Monach. edit.* 2. *p.* 367.

(y) *Lib.* 1. *cont. Creſcon. cap.* 32. & 34.

(z) *De unit. Eccleſ. c.* 19.

Doctrin about not-rebaptizing such as were baptized by Heretiques, is no necessary Point of Faith, nor the contrary an Heresie: wherein he contradicteth S. *Augustine*, from whom we have now heard, that what the Church teacheth, is truly said to be taught by Scripture; and consequently to deny this particular Point, delivered by the Church, is to oppose Scripture it self. Yet if he will needs hold, that this Point is not Fundamental, we must conclude out of S. *Augustine*, (as we did concerning the baptizing of Children) that the infallibility of the Church reacheth to Points not-Fundamental. The same Father in another place, concerning this very question of the validity of Baptism conferred by Heretiques, saith: *The* (a) *Apostles indeed have prescribed nothing of this, but this Custom ought to be believed, to be originally taken from their Tradition, as there are many things that the universal Church observeth, which are therefore with good reason believed to have been commanded by the Apostles, although they be not written.* No less clear is S. *Chrysostom* for the infallibility of the Traditions of the Church. For, treating these words (2 *Thes.* 2. *Stand, and hold the Traditions which you have learned, whether by speech or by Epistle*) he saith: *Hence it is* (b) *manifest that they delivered not all things by letter, but many things also without writing, and these also are worthy of belief. Let us therefore account the Tradition of the Church to be worthy of belief. It is a Tradition: Seek no more.* Which words are so plainly against Protestants, that *Whitaker* is as plain with S. *Chrysostom*, saying: *I answer* (c) *that this is an inconsiderate speech, and unworthy so great a Father.* But let us conclude with S. *Augustine*, that the Church cannot approve any Error against Faith, or good manners. *The Church* (saith he) *being* (d) *placed between much chaff and cockle, doth tolerate many things; but yet she doth not approve, nor dissemble, nor do those things which are against Faith, or good life.*

(a) *De Bapt. cont. Donat. l. 5. c. 23.*

(b) *Hom. 4.*

(c) *De Sacra Script. p. 678.*

(d) *Ep. 119.*

17. And, as I have proved that Protestants, according to their grounds, cannot yield infallible assent to the Church in any one Point: so by the same reason I prove, that they cannot relie upon Scripture it self in any one Point of Faith. Not in Points of lesser moment (or not Fundamental) because in such Points the Catholique Church, (according to D. *Potter*) and much more any Protestant may err, and think it is contained in Scripture, when it is not. Not in Points Fundamental, because they must first know what Points be Fundamental, before they can be assured, that they cannot err in understanding the Scripture; and consequently, independently of Scripture, they must foreknow all Fundamental Points of Faith: and therefore they do not indeed relie upon Scripture either for Fundamental, or not Fundamental Points.

18. Besides, I mainly urge D. *Potter*, and other Protestants, that they tell us of certain Points which they call Fundamental, and we cannot wrest from them a list in particular of such Points, without which no man can tell whether or no he err in Points Fundamental, and be capable of Salvation. And which is most lamentable, instead of giving us such a Catalogue, they fall to wrangle among themselves about the making of it.

19. *Calvin* holds the (e) Pope's Primacy, Invocation of Saints, Freewill, and such like, to be Fundamental Errors overthrowing the Gospel. Others are not of his mind, as *Melanthon*, who saith, in (f) the opinion of himself, and other his Brethren, *That the Monarchy of the Bishop of* Rome *is of use, or profit, to this end, that consent of Doctrin may be retained. An agreement therefore may easily be established in this Article of the Pope's Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon.* If the Pope's Primacy be a means, *that consent of Doctrin may be retained*, first submit to it, and other articles will be *easily agreed upon. Luther* also saith of the Pope's Primacy, it may be *born* (g) *withall.* And why then, O *Luther*, did you not bear with it? And how can you, and your followers be excused from damnable Schism, who chose rather to divide God's Church, then to bear with that, which you confess may be *born withall?* But let us go forward. That the Doctrin of Freewill, Prayer for the dead, worshipping of Images, Worship and Invocation of Saints, Real presence, Transubstantiation, Receiving under one kind, Satisfaction, and Merit of works, and the Mass be not fundamental Errors, is taught (*respective*) by divers Protestants carefully alledged in the *Protestants* (h) *Apology*, &c. as namely by *Perkins*, *Cartwright*, *Frith*, *Fulke*, *Sparke*, *Goad*, *Luther*, *Reynolds*, *Whitaker*, *Tindal*, *Francus Johnson*, with others. Contrary to these, is the *Confession of the Christian Faith*, so called by Protestants, which I mentioned (i) heretofore, wherein we are damned unto *unquenchable fire*, for the Doctrin of Mass, Prayer to Saints, and for the dead, Freewill, Presence at Idol-service, Mans merit, with such like. Justification by Faith alone is by some Protestants affirmed to be the *soul of the* (k) *Church: The only principal origin of* (l) *Salvation; of all other Points of* (m) *Doctrin the chiefest and weightiest.* Which yet, as we have seen is contrary to other Protestants, who teach that merit of good works is not a Fundamental Error; yea, divers Protestants defend merit of good works, as may be seen in (n) *Breereley.* One would think that the King's Supremacy, for which some blessed men lost their lives, was once amongst Protestants held for a Capital Point; but now D. *Andrews* late of *Winchester* in his Book against *Bellarmine* tells us, that it is sufficient to reckon it among *true Doctrins.* And *Wotton* denies that *Protestants* (o) *hold the King's Supremacy to be an essential Point of Faith.* O freedom of the new Gospel! Hold with Catholiques the Pope; or with Protestants, the King; or with Puritans, neither Pope, nor King, to be Head of the Church, all is one, you may be saved. Some, as *Castalio*, (p) and the whole Sect of the Academical Protestants, hold, that Doctrins about the Supper, Baptism, the state, and office of Christ, how he is one with his Father, the Trinity, Predestination, and divers other such questions are not necessary to Salvation. And (that you may observe how ungrounded, and partial their Assertions be) *Perkins* teacheth, that the Real presence of our Saviour's Body in the Sacrament, as it is believed by Catholiques, is a Fundamental Error; and yet affirmeth the Consubstantiation of *Lutherans*, not to be such, notwithstanding that divers chief *Lutherans*, to their Consubstantiation joyn the prodigious Heresie of Ubiquitation. D. *Usher* in his Sermon of *the Unity of the Catholique Faith*, grants Salvation to the *Æthiopians*, who yet with Christian Baptism joyn Circumcision. D. *Potter* (q) cites the Doctrin of some, whom he termeth men of great learning and judgment: that, *all who profess to love and honour* JESUS CHRIST *are in the visible Christian Church, and by Catholiques*

(e) *Instit. l. 4. cap. 2.*

(f) *Cent. Ep. Theol. Ep. 74.*

(g) *In Assertionib. art. 36.*

(h) *Tract. 1. c. 2. Sect. 14. after F.*

(i) *Cap. 1. v. 4.*

(k) Chark *in the Tower disputation, the 4. dayes conference.*

(l) Fox *Act. & Mon. p. 402.*

(m) *The Confession of* Bohemia *in the Harmony of Confessions. p. 253.*

(n) *Tract. 3. Sect. 7. under n. n. 15.*

(o) *In his answer to a Popish pamphlet. p. 68.*

(p) *Vid. Gul. Reginald. Calv. Turcism. l. 2. c. 6.*

(q) *Pag. 113, 114.* *Morton* in his Treatise of the Kingdom of Israel. p. 94.

tholiques to be reputed Brethren One of these men of great learning and judgment, is *Thomas Morton*, by D. *Potter* cited in his Margent, whose love and honour to *Jesus Christ*, you may perceive by this saying, that the *Churches of Arians* (who denied our Saviour Christ to be God) *are to be accounted the Church of God, because they do hold the foundation of the Gospel, which is Faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God, and Saviour of the world.* And, which is more, it seemeth by these charitable men, that for being a member of the Church it is not necessary to believe one only God. For D. *Potter* (r) among the arguments to prove *Hookers* and *Morton's* opinion, brings this: *The people of the ten Tribes after their defection, notwithstanding their gross corruption, and Idolatry*, remained still a true Church. We may also, as it seemeth by these mens reasoning, deny the Resurrection, and yet be members of the true Church. For a learned man (saith D. *Potter* (s) in behalf of *Hooker's* and *Morton's* opinion) was anciently made a Bishop of the Catholique Church, though he did professedly doubt of the last Resurrection of our bodies. Dear Saviour! What times do we behold? If one may be a member of the true Church, and yet deny the Trinity of the Persons, the Godhead of our Saviour, the necessity of Baptism, if we may use Circumcision, and with the worship of God joyn Idolatry, wherein do we differ from Turks, and Jews? or rather, are we not worse than either of them? If they who deny our Saviour's Divinity, might be accounted the Church of God, How will they deny that favour to those ancient Heretiques, who denied our Saviour's true humanity? and so the total denial of Christ will not exclude one from being a member of the true Church. S. *Hilary* (t) maketh it of equal necessity for Salvation, that we believe our Saviour to be true God, and true Man, saying: *This manner of Confession we are to hold, that we remember him to be the Son of God, and the Son of Man, because the one without the other, can give no hope of Salvation.* And yet D. *Potter* saith of the aforesaid doctrin of *Hooker* and *Morton*: *The* (u) *Reader may be pleased to approve, or reject it, as he shall find cause.* And in another place (w) he sheweth so much good liking of this Doctrin, that he explicateth and proveth the Churches perpetual Visibility by it. And in the second Edition of his Book, he is careful to declare, and illustrate it more at large than he had done before: howsoever, this sufficiently sheweth, that they have no certainty what Points be Fundamental. As for the *Arians* in particular, the Author whom D. *Potter* cites for a *moderate Catholique*, but is indeed a plain *Heretique*, or rather Atheist, *Lucian*-like jesting at all Religion, (x) placeth *Arianism* among Fundamental Errors: But contrarily, an English Protestant Divine masked under the name of *Irenæus Philalethes*, in a little Book in Latine, intituled, *Dissertatio de pace, & concordia Ecclesiæ*, endeavoureth to prove, that even the denial of the Blessed Trinity may stand with Salvation. Divers Protestants have taught, that the Roman Church, erreth in Fundamental Points. But D. *Potter*, and others teach the contrary, which could not happen if they could agree what be Fundamental Points. You brand the *Donatists* with the note of an Error, *in the matter* (y) *and the nature of it properly heretical*; because they taught that the Church remained only with them, in the part of *Donatus*. And yet many Protestants are so far from holding that Doctrin to be a Fundamental Error, that themselves go further, and say; that for divers ages before *Luther* there was no true Visible Church at all. It is then too too apparent, that you have no agreement in specifying, what be Fundamental Points; neither have you any means to determine what they be; for, if you have any such means, Why do you not agree? You tell us, The *Creed* contains all Points Fundamental: which, although it were true, yet you see it serves not to bring you to a particular knowledge, and agreement in such Points. And no wonder. For (besides what I have said already in the beginning of this Chapter, and am to deliver more at large in the next) after so much labour and paper spent to prove that the *Creed* contains all Fundamental Points, you conclude: *It remains* (a) *very probable, that the Creed is the perfect Summary of those Fundamental truths, whereof consists the Unity of Faith, and of the Catholique Church.* Very *probable?* Then, according to all good Logick, the contrary may *remain very probable*, and so all remain as full of uncertainty, as before. The whole *Rule*, say you, and the sole *Judge* of your Faith, must be Scripture. Scripture doth indeed deliver divine Truths, but seldom doth qualifie them, or declare whether they be, or be not, absolutely necessary to Salvation. You fall (b) heavy upon *Charity Mistaken*, because he demands a particular Catalogue of Fundamental Points, which yet you are obliged in conscience to do, if you be able. For without such a Catalogue, no man can be assured whether or no he have Faith sufficient to Salvation. And therefore take it not in ill part, if we again and again demand such a Catalogue. And that you may see we proceed fairly, I will perform, on our behalf, what we request of you, and do here deliver a Catalogue, wherein are comprised all Points by us taught to be necessary to Salvation in these words; *We are obliged under pain of damnation, to believe whatsoever the Catholique Visible Church of Christ proposeth, as revealed by Almighty God.* If any be of another mind, all Catholiques denounce him to be no Catholique. But enough of this. And I go forward with the Infallibility of the Church in all Points.

(r) Pag. 121.
(s) Pag. 122.
(t) Comment. in Mat. cap. 16.
(u) Pag. 123.
(w) Pag. 253.
(x) *A moderate examination, &c. cap. 1. paulò post initium.*
(y) Pag. 126.
(a) Pag. 241.
(b) Pag. 215.

20. For, even out of your own Doctrin, that the Church cannot err in Points necessary to Salvation, any wise man will infer, that it behoves all who have care of their souls, not to forsake her in any one Point. 1. Because they are assured, that although her Doctrine proved not to be true, in some Point, yet, even according to D. *Potter*, the Error cannot be Fundamental, nor destructive of Faith, and Salvation: neither can they be accused of any the least imprudence, in erring (if it were possible) with the universal Church. Secondly, since she is, under pain of eternal damnation, to be believed, and obeyed in some things, wherein confessedly she is indued with infallibility; I cannot in wisdom suspect her credit in matters of less moment. For who would trust another in matters of highest consequence, and be afraid to relie on him in things of less moment? Thirdly, since (as I said) we are undoubtedly obliged not to forsake her in the chiefest, or Fundamental Points; and that there is no Rule to know precisely what, and how many those Fundamental Points be; I cannot without hazard of my soul leave her in any one Point, lest perhaps that Point, or Points, wherein I forsake her, prove indeed to be Fundamental, and necessary to Salvation. Fourthly, that Visible Church, which cannot

err in Points Fundamental, doth without distinction propound all her Definitions concerning matters of Faith to be believed under Anathema's or Curses, esteeming all those who resist, to be deservedly cast out of her Communion, and holding it a Point necessary to Salvation, that we believe she cannot err: wherein if he speak true, then to deny any one point in *particular*, which she defineth, or to affirm in *general*, that she may err, puts a man into a state of damnation. Whereas to believe her in such Points as are not necessary to Salvation, cannot endanger Salvation; and likewise to remain in her Communion, can bring no great harm, because she cannot maintain any damnable error, or practice: but to be divided from her (the being Christ's Catholique Church) is most certainly damnable. Fifthly, the true Church, being in lawful and certain possession of Superiority and Power, to command and require Obedience, from all Christians in some things; I cannot without grievous sin withdraw my obedience in any one, unless I evidently know, that the thing commanded comes not within the compass of those things to which her Power extendeth. And who can better inform me, how far God's Church can proceed, than God's Church her self? Or to what Doctor can the Children and Scholars, with greater reason, and more security flye for direction, than to the *Mother*, and appointed *Teacher* of all Christians? In following her, I shall sooner be excused, than in cleaving to any particular Sect, or Person, teaching or applying Scriptures against her Doctrin, or Interpretation. Sixthly, the fearful examples of innumerable persons, who, forsaking the Church upon pretence of her Errors, have failed even in Fundamental Points, and suffered shipwrack of their Salvation, ought to deter all Christians from opposing her in any one Doctrin, or practice: as (to omit other, both ancient and modern heresies) we see that divers chief Protestants, pretending to reform the corruptions of the Church, are come to affirm, that for many ages she erred to death, and wholly perished; which D. *Potter* cannot deny to be a Fundamental Error against that Article of our Creed, *I believe the Catholique Church*, as he affirmeth it of the *Donatists*, because they confined the Universal Church within *Africa*, or some other small tract of soil. Lest therefore I may fall into some Fundamental Error, it is most safe for me to believe all the Decrees of that Church which cannot err fundamentally: especially if we add, That, according to the Doctrin of Catholique Divines, one error in Faith, whether it be for the matter it self, great or small, destroys Faith, as is shewed in *Charity Mistaken*; and consequently to accuse the Church of any one Error, is to affirm, that she lost all Faith, and erred damnably: which very saying is damnable, because it leaves Christ no visible Church on earth.

(c) *Pag.* 75. 21. To all these Arguments I add this Demonstration: D. *Potter* teacheth, that *there neither was* (c) *nor can be any just cause to depart from the Church of Christ, no more than from Christ himself.* But if the Church of Christ can err in some Points of Faith, men not only may, but must forsake her in those, (unless D. *Potter* will have them to believe one thing, and profess another:) and if such errors and corruptions should fall out to be about the Churches Liturgy, publique Service, administration of Sacraments, & the like; they who perceive such errors, must of necessity leave her external Communion. And therefore, if once we grant the Church may err, it followeth that men may, and ought to forsake her (which is against D. *Potter's* own words,) or else they are inexcusable who left the Communion of the *Roman* Church, under pretence of errors, which they grant not to be Fundamental. And, if D. *Potter* think good to answer this argument, he must remember his own Doctrin to be, that even the Catholique Church may err in Points not Fundamental.

(d) *Pag.* 97. 22. Another argument for the universal Infallibility of the Church, I take out of D. *Potter's* own words. *If* (saith he) *we* (d) *did not dissent in some opinions from the present* Roman *Church, we could not agree with the Church truly Catholique.* These words cannot be true, unless he presuppose that the *Church truly Catholique*, cannot err in Points not Fundamental. For if she may err in such Points, the *Roman* Church which he affirmeth to err only in Points *not Fundamental*, may agree with the *Church truly Catholique*, if she likewise may err in Points *not Fundamental.* Therefore either he must acknowledge a plain contradiction in his own words, or else must grant that the *Church truly Catholique* cannot err in Points *not Fundamental*, which is what we intended to prove.

23. If *Words* cannot perswade you, that in all Controversies you must relie upon the infallibility of the Church; at least yield your assent to *Deeds.* Hitherto I have produced Arguments drawn as it were, *ex natura rei*, from the Wisdom and Goodness of God, who cannot fail to have left some infallible means to determine Controversies, which, as we have proved, can be no other, except a Visible Church, infallible in all her Definitions. But because both Catholiques and Protestants receive holy Scripture, we may thence also prove the infallibility of the Church in all matters which concern Faith and Religion. Our Saviour speaketh clearly: *The Gates of Hell* (e) *shall not prevail against her.* And, *I will ask my* (f) *Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, The Spirit of Truth.* And, *But when he, the Spirit of* (g) *Truth cometh, he shall teach you all Truth.* The Apostle saith, that the Church is *the Pillar, and ground of* (h) *Truth.* And, *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints unto the work of the Ministry, unto the edifying of the Body of Christ: until we meet all into the unity of Faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, into the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ: that now we be not children, wavering, and carried about with every wind of Doctrin in the wickedness of men, in craftiness, to the circumvention* (i) *of Error.* All which words seem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is universally infallible, without which, unity of Faith could not be conserved against *every wind of Doctrin.* And yet D. *Potter* (k) limits these promises and priviledges to *Fundamental* Points, in which he grants, the Church cannot err. I urge the words of Scripture which are universal, and do not mention any such restraint. I alledge that most reasonable, and Received Rule, that Scripture is to be understood literally, as it soundeth, unless some manifest absurdity force us to the contrary. But all will not serve, to accord our different interpretation. In the mean time divers of D. *Potter's* Brethren step in, and reject his limitation, as over-large, and somewhat tasting of Papistry:

(e) Mat. 16.
(f) Joan. 14.
(g) Joan. 16.
(h) 1 Tim. c. 3.
(i) Ephes. 4.
(k) *Pag.* 151, 153.

And

And therefore they reſtrain the mentioned Texts, either to the Infallibility which the Apoſtles, and other ſacred Writers had in penning of Scripture: or elſe to the *inviſible* Church of the Elect; and to them, not abſolutely, but with a double reſtriction, that they ſhall not fall *damnably*, and *finally*; and other men have as much right as theſe, to interpoſe their opinion and interpretation. Behold we are three at debate about the ſelfeſame words of Scripture: We confer divers places and Texts: We conſult the Originals: We examine Tranſlations: We endeavour to pray heartily: We profeſs to ſpeak ſincerely: To ſeek nothing but Truth, and Salvation of our own ſouls, and that of our Neighbours; and finally, we uſe all thoſe means, which by Proteſtants themſelves are preſcribed for finding out the true meaning of Scripture: Nevertheleſs we neither do, or have any poſſible means to agree, as long as we are left to our ſelves; and when we ſhould chance to be agreed, the doubt would ſtill remain whether the thing it ſelf be a *Fundamental* Point or no: And yet it were great impiety to imagine that God, the lover of Souls, hath left no certain infallible means, to decide both this, and all other differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion. Our remedy therefore in theſe contentions muſt be, to conſult, and hear Gods Viſible Church, with ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Power, and Infallibility in whatſoever ſhe propoſeth as a revealed Truth: according to that divine advice of St. *Auguſtine* in theſe words: *If at length* (1) *thou ſeem to be ſufficiently toſſed, and haſt a deſire to put an end to thy pains, follow the way of the Catholique Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelf, by the Apoſtles, hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity.* And though I conceive that the diſtinction of Points *Fundamental*, and *not Fundamental*, hath now been ſufficiently confuted; yet that no ſhadow of difficulty may remain, I will particularly refel a common ſaying of Proteſtants, that it is ſufficient for Salvation, to believe the Apoſtles Creed, which they hold to be a Summary of all Fundamental Points of Faith.

(1) *De util. cred. cap.* 8.

The ANSWER to the THIRD CHAPTER.

Wherein it is maintained, That the diſtinction of Points Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholique Church may err in the latter kind of the ſaid Points.*

1. THis Diſtinction is imployed by Proteſtants to many purpoſes, and therefore, if it be pertinent and good, (as they underſtand and apply it) the whole edifice built thereon, muſt be either firme and ſtable; or, if it be not, it cannot be for any default in this Diſtinction.

2. *If you object to them diſcords in matter of Faith without any means of agreement*, They will anſwer you, that they want not good and ſolid means of agreement in matters neceſſary to Salvation, *viz.* Their beliefe of all thoſe things which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, which who ſo believes, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary to Salvation: and their mutual ſuffering one another *to abound in their ſeveral ſenſe*, in matters not plainly and undoubtedly there delivered. And for their agreement in all Controverſies of Religion, either they have means to agree about them, or not: If you ſay they have, why did you before deny it? If they have not means, why do you find fault with them, for not agreeing?

3. You will ſay, that their fault is, that *by remaining Proteſtants, they exclude themſelves from the means of agreement, which you have*, and which by ſubmiſſion to your Church they might have alſo. But if you have means of agreement, the more ſhame for you that you ſtil diſagree. For who, I pray, is more inexcuſably guilty, for the omiſſion of any duty; they that either have no means to do it, or elſe know of none they have, which puts them in the ſame caſe, if as they had none: or they which profeſſe to have an eaſie and expedite means to do it, and yet ſtill leave it undone? *If you had been blind* (ſaith our *Saviour* to the *Phariſees*) *you had had no ſin; but now you ſay you ſee, therefore your ſin remaineth.*

4. If you say, you *do agree in matters of Faith*, I say this is ridiculous, for you define matters of Faith to be those wherein you agree. So that to say, you agree in *matters of Faith*, is to say, you agree in those things wherein you do agree. And do not Protestants do so likewise? Do not they agree in those things, wherein they do agree?

5. But *you are all agreed, that only those things wherein you do agree are matters of Faith.* And Protestants, if they were wise, would do so too. Sure I am they have reason enough to do so: seeing all of them agree with explicite Faith in all those things, which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, that is, in all which God hath plainly revealed: and with an implicite Faith, in that sense of the whole Scripture which God intended whatsoever was. Secondly, That which you pretend is false; for else, why do some of you hold it against faith, to take or allow the *Oath of Allegiance*; others as learned and honest as they, that it is against Faith and unlawful to refuse it, and allow the refusing of it? Why do some of you hold, that it is *de Fide*, that the Pope is Head of the Church by divine Law, others the contrary? Some hold it *de Fide*, that the blessed Virgin was free from Actual sin, others that it is not so. Some, that the Popes Indirect power over Princes in Temporalties is *de Fide*, Others the contrary. Some, that it is Universal Tradition, and consequently *de Fide*, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in original sin, Others the contrary.

6. But what shall we say now, if you be not agreed touching your pretended means of Agreement, how then can you pretend to Unity either Actual or Potential more than Protestants may? Some of you say, the Pope alone without a Councel may determine all Controversies: But others deny it. Some, that a general Councel without a Pope may do so: Others deny this. Some, Both in conjunction are infallible determiners: Others again deny this. Lastly, some among you, hold the Acceptation of the Decrees of Councels by the Universal Church to be the only way to decide Controversies: which others deny, by denying the Church to be Infallible. And indeed, what way of ending Controversies can this be, when either part may pretend, that they are part of the Church, and they receive not the Decree, therefore the whole Church hath not received it?

7. Again, Means of agreeing differences are either rational and well-grounded, and of Gods appointment; or voluntary and taken up at the pleasure of men. Means of the former nature, we say, you have as little as we. For where hath God appointed, that the Pope, or a Councel, or a Councel confirmed by the Pope, or that Society of Christians which adhere to him, shall be the *Infallible Judge of Controversies?* I desire you to shew any one of these Assertions plainly set down in Scripture, (as in all reason a thing of this nature should be) or at least delivered with a full consent of Fathers, or at least taught in plain tearms by any one Father for four huudred yeers after Christ. And if you cannot do this (as I am sure you cannot) and yet will still be obtruding your selves upon us for our Judges, Who will not cry out,

——— *perisse frontem de rebus?*

8. But then for means of the other kind, such as yours are, we have great abundance of them. For besides all the ways which you have devised, which we may make use of when we please, we have a great many more, which you yet have never thought of, for which we have as good colour

colour out of Scripture, as you have for yours. For first, we could, if we would, try it by Lots, whose Doctrine is true, and whose false. And you know it is written, (a) *The Lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposition of it is from the Lord.* 2. We could referre them to the King, and you know it is written, (b) *A Divine sentence is in the lips of the King; his mouth transgresseth not in judgement.* (c) *The Heart of the King is in the hand of the Lord.* We could referre the matter to any Assembly of Christians assembled in the Name of Christ, seeing it is written, (d) *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.* We may refer it to any Priest, because it is written, (e) *The Priests lips shall preserve knowledg.* (f) *The Scribes and Pharises sit in Moses chair, &c.* To any Preacher of the Gospel, to any Pastor, or Doctor, for to every one of them Christ hath promised, (g) *He will be with them alwaies even to the end of the world*: and of every one of them it is said (h) *He that heareth you, heareth me, &c.* To any Bishop, or Prelate; for it is written, (i) *Obey your Prelates*, and again, (k) *He hath given Pastors, and Doctors, &c lest we should be carryed about with every wind of Doctrin.* To any particular Church of Christians, seeing it is a particular Church which is called (l) *The house of God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth*: and seeing of any particular Church it is written, (m) *He that heareth not the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen or Publican.* We might refer it to any man that prayes for Gods Spirit; for it is written, (n) *Every one that asketh, receiveth*: and again, (o) *If any man want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* Lastly, we might refer it to the Jews, for without all doubt of them it is written, (p) *My Spirit that is in thee, &c.* All these means of agreement, whereof not any one but hath as much probability from Scripture, as that which you obtrude upon us, offer themselves upon a sudden to me: haply many more might be thought on, if we had time, but these are enough to shew, that would we make use of voluntary and devised means to determine differences, we had them in great abundance. And if you say, These would fail us and contradict themselves: So, as we pretend, have yours. There have been Popes against Popes: Councels against Councels: Councels confirmed by Popes against Councels confirmed by Popes: Lastly, the Church of some Ages against the Church of other Ages.

(a) Pro. 16 33. (b) Pro. 16. 10. (c) Prov. 21. 1. (d) Mat. 18. 20. (e) Mal. 2. 7. (f) Mat. 25. 2. (g) Mat. 28. 20. (h) Luk. 10. 16. (i) Heb. 13. 17. (k) Eph. 4. 11. (l) 1 Tim. 3. 15. (m) Mat. 18. 17. (n) Mat. 7. 8. (o) Jam. 1. 5. (p) Isa. 59. 21.

9. Lastly, whereas you find fault, *That Protestants upbraided with their discords, answer, that they differ only in Points not Fundamental*: I desire you tell me, Whether they do so, or do not so; If they do so, I hope you will not find fault with the Answer; If you say, they do not so, but in Points Fundamental also, then they are not members of the same Church one with another, no more than with you: And therefore why should you object to any of them, their differences from each other, any more than to your selves, their more and greater differences from you?

10. But *they are convinced sometimes even by their own confessions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers Points of Popery: and then they reply, those Fathers may nevertheless be saved, because those errors were not Fundamentall.* And may not you also be convinced by the confessions of your own men, that the Fathers taught divers Points held by Protestants against the Church of *Rome*, and divers against Protestants and the Church of *Rome*? Do not your *Purging Indexes* clip the tongues, and seal up the lips of a great many for such confessions? And is not the above-cited confession of

your

your *Doway* Divines, plain and full to the same purpose? And do not you also, as freely as we, charge the Fathers with errors, and yet say they were saved? Now what else do we understand by an *unfundamental* error, but such a one with which a man may possibly be saved? So that still you proceed in condemning others for your own faults, and urging Arguments against us, which return more strongly upon your selves.

11. But your will is, *We should remember that Christ must alwaies have a Visible Church.* Ans. Your pleasure shall be obeyed, on condition you will not forget, that there is a difference between perpetual Visibility, and perpetual Purity. As for the Answer which you make for us, true it is, we believe the *Catholique Church cannot perish*, yet that she may, and did, erre in Points not Fundamental; and that Protestants were obliged to forsake these errors of the Church, as they did, though not the Church for her errors, for that they did not, but continued still Members of the Church. For it is not all one (though you perpetually confound them) *to forsake the errors of the Church*, and to *forsake the Church*: or to *forsake the Church in her error*, and *simply to forsake the Church*: no more then it is for me to renounce my Brothers or my Friends Vices or Errors, and to renounce my Brother or my Friend. The former then was done by Protestants, the latter was not done. Nay not only, not from the Catholique, but not so much as from the *Roman*, did they separate *peromnia*; but only in those practices which they conceived superstitious or impious. If you would at this time propose a form of Liturgy, which both Sides hold lawful, and then they would not joyn with you in this Liturgy, you might have some colour then to say, they renounce your Communion absolutely. But as things are now ordered, they cannot joyne with you in Prayers, but they must partake with with you in unlawful practices, and for this reason, they (*not absolutely, but thus farre*) separate from your Communion. And this, I say, they were obliged to do under pain of damnation. *Not as if it were damnable to hold an error not damnable*, but because it is damnable outwardly to profess and maintain it, and to joyn with others in the practice of it, when inwardly they did not hold it. Now had they continued in your Communion, that they must have done, *viz.* have professed to believe, and externally practised your Errors, whereof they were convinced that they were Errors: which, though the matters of the Errors had been not necessary, but only profitable, whether it had not been damnable dissimulation and hypocrisie, I leave it to you to judge. You your self tell us within two pages after this, *That you are obliged, never to speak any one least lye against your knowledge*, §. 2. Now what is this but to live in a perpetual lye?

12. As for that which in the next place you seem so to wonder at, That *both Catholiques and Protestants, according to the opinion of Protestants, may be saved in their several professions, because, forsooth, we both agree in all Fundamental points.* I Answer, this Proposition so crudely set down, as you have here set it down, I know no Protestant will justifie. For you seem to make them teach, that it is an indifferent thing, for the attainment of Salvation, whether a man believe the Truth or the Falshood; and that they care not in whether of these Religions a man live or dye, so he dye in either of them: whereas all that they say is this, That those amongst you which want means to find the Truth, and so dye in Error; or use the best means they can with industry, and without partiality to find the Truth,

Truth, and yet dye in error, these men, thus qualified, notwithstanding these errors may be saved. Secondly, for those that have means to find the Truth, and will not use them, they conceive, though their case be dangerous, yet if they die with a general repentance for all their sins, known and unknown, their Salvation is not desperate. The Truths which they hold of Faith in Christ, and Repentance, being as it were an Antidote against their Errors, and their negligence in seeking the Truth. Especially, seeing by confession of both sides we agree in much more than is simply, and indispensably necessary to salvation.

13. *But seeing we make such various use of this Distinction, is it not prodigiously strange that we will never be induced to give in a particular Catalogue what points be Fundamental?* And why, I pray, is it so *prodigiously strange*, that we give no answer to an unreasonable demand? God himself hath told us, (a) *That where much is given, much shall be required; where little is given, little shall be required.* To Infants, Deaf-men, Mad-men, nothing, for ought we know, is given; and if it be so, of them *nothing* shall be required. Others perhaps may have means only given them to believe, (b) *That God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him*; and to whom thus much only is given, to them it shal not be damnable, that they believe but only thus much. Which me thinks is very manifest from the Apostle, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where having first said, *That without Faith it is impossible to please God*, he subjoyns as his reason, *For whosoever cometh unto God, must believe that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him.* Where, in my opinion, this is plainly intimated, that this is the *minimum quod sic*, the lowest degree of Faith, wherewith, in men capable of Faith, God will be pleased: and that with this lowest degree he will be pleased, where means of rising higher are deficient. Besides, if without this belief, *That God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him*, God will not be pleased, then his will is, that we should believe it. Now his will it cannot be, that we should believe a Falshood, It must be therefore true, that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him. Now it is possible, that they which never heard of Christ, may seek God: therefore it is true, that even they shall please him, and be rewarded by him; I say, rewarded, not with bringing them immediately to Salvation without Christ, but with bringing them according to his good pleasure, first, to Faith in Christ, and so to Salvation. To which belief the Story of *Cornelius* in the 10. *Chapter of the Acts* of the Apostles, and S. *Peter*'s words to him, are to me a great inducement. For first it is evident he believed not in Christ, but was a meer Gentile, and one that knew not but men might be worshipped, and yet we are assured *that his prayers and alms* (even while he was in that state) *came up for a memorial before God*; *That his prayer was heard, and his Alms had in remembrance in the sight of God*, ver. 4. That upon his *Then fearing God, and working righteousness*, (such as it was) *he was accepted with God.* But how accepted? Not to be brought immediately to Salvation, but to be promoted to a higher degree of the knowledg of Gods will: For so it is in the 4. and 5. v. *Call for* Simon *whose sirname is* Peter, *he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do:* and at the 33. v. *We are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.* So that though even in his Gentilism, he was accepted in his present state, yet if he had continued in it, & refused to believe in Christ after the sufficient revelation of the Gospel

(a) Luk 12.48.

(b) Heb. 11. 6.

to

to him, and God's will to have him believe it, he that was accepted before, would not have continued accepted still; for then that condemnation had come upon him, *That light was come unto him, and he loved darkness more than light.* So that (to proceed a step farther) to whom Faith in Christ is sufficiently propounded, as necessary to Salvation, to them it is simply necessary and fundamental to believe in Christ, that is, to expect remission of sins and Salvation from him, upon the performance of the conditions he requires; among which conditions one is, that we believe what he hath revealed, when it is sufficiently declared, to have been revealed by him: For by doing so, *we set to our seal, that God is true, and that Christ was sent by him.* Now that may be sufficiently declared to one (all things considered,) which (all things considered) to another is not sufficiently declared: and consequently that may be fundamental and necessary to one, which to another is not so. Which variety of Circumstances, makes it impossible to set down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals, and proves your request as reasonable, as if you should desire us (according to the Fable) to make a coat to fit the Moon in all her changes; or to give you a garment that will fit all statures; or to make you a Dial to serve all Meridians; or to design particularly, what provision will serve an Army for a year: whereas there may be an Army of ten thousand, there may be of one hundred thousand.. And therefore without setting down a Catalogue of Fundamentals in particular, (because none that can be given, can universally serve for all men, God requiring more of them to whom he gives more, and less of them to whom he gives less) we must content our selves by a general description to tell you what is Fundamental. And to warrant us in doing so, we have your own example §. 19. where being engaged to give us a Catalogue of Fundamentals, instead thereof you tell us only in general, *That all is Fundamental, and not to be disbelieved under pain of damnation, which the Church hath defined.* As you therefore think it enough to say in general, *That all is fundamental which the Church hath defined*, without setting down in particular a compleat Catalogue of all things, which in any Age the Church hath defined (which, I believe, you will not undertake to do; and, if you do, it will be contradicted by your Fellows:) So in reason you might think it enough for us also to say in general, *That it is sufficient for any mans salvation to believe that the Scripture is true, and contains all things necessary for salvation; and to do his best endeavour to find and believe the true sense of it:* without delivering any particular Catalogue of the Fundamentals of Faith.

14. Neither *doth the want of such a Catalogue* leave us in such a *perplexed uncertainty* as you pretend. For though perhaps we cannot exactly distinguish in the Scripture, what *is revealed because it is necessary*, from what is *necessary, consequently and accidentally, meerly because it is revealed*: yet we are sure enough, that all that is necessary any way, is there; and therefore in believing all that is there, we are sure to believe all that is necessary. And if we err from the true & intended sense of some, nay of many obscure and ambiguous Texts of Scripture, yet we may be sure enough, that we err not damnably: because, if we do indeed desire and endeavour to find the Truth, we may be sure we do so, and as sure that it cannot consist with the revealed goodness of God, to damn him for error, that desires and indeavours to find the Truth.

15. *As*

15. *Ad §. 2.* The effect of this Paragraph (for as much as concerns us) is this, That *for any man to deny belief to any one thing, be it great or small, known by him, to be revealed by Almighty God for a Truth, is in effect to charge God with falshood: for it is to say, that God affirms that to be Truth, which he either knows to be not a Truth, or which he doth not know to be a Truth: and therefore without all controversie this is a damnable sin.* To this I subscribe with hand and heart: adding withall, that not only he which knows, but he which believes (nay, though it be erroneously) any thing to be revealed by God, and yet will not believe it, nor assent unto it, is in the same case, and commits the same sin of derogation from Gods most perfect and pure Veracity.

16. *Ad §. 3.* I said purposely (*known by himself, and believes himself*) For as, without any disparagement of a mans honesty, I may believe something to be false, which he affirms, of his certain knowledge to be true; provided I neither know nor believe that he hath so affirmed: So without any the least dishonour to Gods eternal never-failing veracity, I may doubt of, or deny some Truth revealed by him, if I neither know nor believe it to be revealed by him.

17. Seeing therefore the crime of calling Gods Veracity into question, and consequently (according to your grounds) of erring Fundamentally, is chargeable upon those only, that *believe the contrary* of any one *point known (not by others, but themselves) to be testified by God*: I cannot but fear (though I hope otherwise) that your heart condemned you of a great calumny and egregious sophistry in imputing Fundamental, and damnable Errors to disagreeing Protestants; Because forsooth, *some of them disbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppose, what others do believe to be testified by the Word of God.* The sophistry of your Discourse will be apparent, if it be contrived into a Syllogism: Thus therefore in effect you argue;

Whosoever disbelieves any thing known by himself to be revealed by God, imputes falshood to God, and therefore errs fundamentally:

But some Protestants disbelieve those things, which Others believe to be testified by God;

Therefore they impute falshood to God, and err Fundamentally.

Neither can you with any colour pretend, that in these words *known to be testified by God*, you meant, *not by himself, but by any other:* Seeing he only in fact affirms, that God doth deceive or is deceived, who denyes some things which himself knows or believes to be revealed by God, as before I have demonstrated. For otherwise, if I should deny belief to some things which God had revealed secretly to such a man as I had never heard of, I should be guilty of calling Gods Veracity into Question, which is evidently false. Besides, how can it be avoided, but the Jesuits and Dominicans and Franciscans must upon this ground differ Fundamentally, and one of them err damnably, seeing the one of them disbelieves, and willingly opposes, what the others believe to be the Word of God?

18. Whereas you say, that *The difference among Protestants consists not in this, that some believe some points, of which others are ignorant, or not bound expressly to know:* I would gladly know, whether you speak of Protestants differing *in profession only, or in opinion also.* If the first, why do you say presently after, *that same disbelieve, what others of them believe?* If they differ in opinion, then sure they are ignorant of the truth of each others opinions: it being impossible and contradictious, that a man should know one thing

to

to be true, and believe the contrary; or know it, and not believe it. And if they do not know the truth of each others opinions; then, I hope, you will grant they are ignorant of it. If your meaning were, they *were not ignorant, that each other held these Opinions, or of the sense of the opinions which they held*; I answer, This is nothing to the convincing of their understandings of the truth of them; and these remaining unconvinced of the truth of them, they are excusable if they do not believe.

19. But, ignorance of what we are expresly bound to know, is it self a fault, and therefore cannot be an excuse: and therefore if you could shew, the Protestants differ in those points, the truth whereof (which can be but one) they were bound expresly to know, I should easily yield that one side must of necessity be in a mortal crime. But for want of proof of this, you content your self only to say it; and therefore I also might be contented only to deny it, yet I will not, but give a reason for my denyal. And my reason is, because our Obligation expresly to know any Divine Truth, must arise from Gods manifest revealing of it, and his revealing unto us that he hath revealed it, and that his will is, we should believe it: Now in the Points controverted among Protestants, he hath not so dealt with us, therefore he hath not laid any such Obligation upon us. The Major of this Syllogism is evident, and therefore I will not stand to prove it. The Minor also will be evident to him that considers, That in all the Controversies of Protestants, there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, Reason with Reason, Authority with Authority: which how it can consist with the manifest revealing of the truth of either Side, I cannot well understand. Besides, though we grant that Scripture, Reason, and Authority, were all on one side, and the appearances of the other side all easily answerable: yet if we consider the strange power that Education, and Prejudices instilled by it, have over even excellent understandings, we may well imagine, that many truths which in themselves are revealed plainly enough, are yet to such or such a man, prepossest with contrary opinions, not revealed plainly. Neither doubt I but God, who knows whereof we are made, and what passions we are subject unto, will compassionate such infirmities, and not enter into judgment with us for those things, which, all things considered, were unavoidable.

20. *But till Fundamentals* (say you) *be sufficiently proposed (as revealed by God) it is not against Faith to reject them; or rather, it is not possible, prudently to believe them: And points unfundamental being thus sufficiently proposed as divine Truths, may not be denyed: Therefore you conclude, there is no difference between them.* *Answ.* A Circumstantial point may by accident become Fundamental, because it may be so proposed, that the denyal of it, will draw after it the denyal of this Fundamental truth, *That all which God says is true.* Notwithstanding in themselves there is a main difference between them: *Points fundamental being those only which are revealed by God, and commanded to be preacht to all, and believed by all. Points Circumstantial, being such, as though God hath revealed them, yet the Pastors of the Church are not bound under pain of damnation particularly to teach them unto all men every where, and the people may be securely ignorant of them.*

21. You say, *Not erring in points fundamental, is not sufficient for the preservation of the Church; because any Error maintained by it against Gods Revelation is destructive.* I answer. If you mean against Gods revelation known by

by the Church to be ſo, it is true; but impoſſible that the Church ſhould ſhould do ſo; for *ipſo Facto* in doing it, it were a Church no longer. But, if you mean againſt ſome Revelation, which the Church by error thinks to be no Revelation, it is falſe. The Church may ignorantly dis-believe ſuch a Revelation, and yet continue a Church; which thus I prove: That the Goſpel was to be preached to all Nations, was a Truth revealed before our Saviour's Aſcenſion, in theſe words, *Go and teach all Nations*, Mat. 28. 19. Yet through prejudice or inadvertence, or ſome other cauſe, the Church disbelieved it, as it is apparent out of the 11. and 12. Chap. of the *Acts*, until the converſion of *Cornelius*; and yet was ſtill a Church. Therefore to disbelieve ſome divine Revelation, not knowing it to be ſo, is not deſtructive of ſalvation, or of the being of the Church. Again, it is a plain Revelation of God, that (a) the Sacrament of the Euchariſt *ſhould be adminiſtred in both kinds*: and (b) that the publique Hymns and *Prayers of the Church ſhould be in ſuch a language as is moſt for edification*; yet theſe Revelations the Church of *Rome* not ſeeing, by reaſon of the veil before their eye, their Churches ſuppoſed Infallibility; I hope, the denial of them ſhall not be laid to their charge, no otherwiſe than as building hay and ſtubble on the Foundation, not overthrowing the Foundation it ſelf.

(a) 1 Cor. 11. 28.
(b) 1 Cor. 14. 15, 16, 26.

22. *Ad §.* 2. In the beginning of this Paragraph, we have this Argument againſt this Diſtinction; *It is enough (by D.* Potter's *confeſſion) to believe ſome things negatively*, i.e. *not to deny them*; *Therefore all denial of any divine truth excludes Salvation.* As if you ſhould ſay, One Horſe is enough for a man to go a journey: Therefore without a Horſe no man can go a journey. As if ſome Divine Truths, *viz.* thoſe which are plainly revealed, might not be ſuch, as of neceſſity were not to be denied: and others, for want of ſufficient declaration, deniable without danger. Indeed, if D. *Potter* had ſaid there had been no divine Truth, declared ſufficiently or not declared, but muſt upon pain of damnation be believed, or at leaſt not denied; then might you juſtly have concluded as you do: but now, that ſome may not be denied, and that ſome may be denied without damnation, why they may not both ſtand together, I do not yet underſtand.

23. In the remainder you infer out of D. *Potter*'s words, *That all errors are alike damnable, if the manner of propounding the contrary Truths be not different*: which, for ought I know, all Proteſtants, and all that have ſenſe muſt grant. Yet I deny your Illation from hence, That *the diſtinction of points into Fundamental and Unfundamental, is vain and uneffectual for the purpoſe of Proteſtants.* For though being alike propoſed as divine Truths, they are by accident alike neceſſary, yet the real difference ſtill remains between them, that they are not alike neceſſary to be propoſed.

24. *Ad §.* 5. The next Paragraph, if it be brought out of the clouds, will, I believe, have in it theſe Propoſitions. 1. *Things are diſtinguiſhed by their different natures.* 2. *The Nature of Faith is taken, not from the matter believed, for then they that believed different matters ſhould haue different Faiths, but from the Motive to it.* 3. *This Motive is Gods Revelation.* 4. *This Revelation is alike for all objects.* 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God: Therefore they forſake the formal motive of Faith: and therefore have no Faith nor Unity therein.* Which is truly a very proper and convenient Argument to cloſe up a weak Diſcourſe, wherein both the Propoſitions are falſe for matter, confuſed and diſordered for the form, and the Con-

cluſion utterly inconſequent. Firſt, for the ſecond Propoſition; Who knows not that the Eſſence of all Habits (and therefore of Faith among the reſt) is taken from their Act, and their Object? If the Habit be general, from the Act and Object in general; if the Habit be ſpecial, from the Act and Object in ſpecial. Then for the Motive to a thing; that it cannot be of the Eſſence of the thing to which it moves, who can doubt that knows that a Motive is an efficient cauſe, and that the efficient is always extrinſecal to the effect? For the fourth, that *Gods Revelation is alike for all objects*, It is ambiguous: and if the ſenſe of it be, that his Revelation is an equal Motive to induce us to believe all objects revealed by him, it is true, but impertinent: If the ſenſe of it be, that all objects revealed by God are alike (that is, alike plainly and undoubtedly) revealed by him, it is pertinent, but moſt untrue. Witneſs the great diverſity of Texts of Scripture, whereof ſome are ſo plain and evident, that no man of ordinary ſenſe can miſtake the ſenſe of them. Some are ſo obſcure and ambiguous, that to ſay, this or this is the certain ſenſe of them, were high preſumption. For the fifth; *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God*! In themſelves perhaps, but not equally to them, whoſe underſtandings by reaſon of their different Educations are faſhioned, and ſhaped for the entertainment of various opinions, and conſequently ſome of them, more enclined to believe ſuch a ſenſe of Scripture, others to believe another; which to ſay that God will not take into his conſideration in judging mens opinions, is to diſparage his goodneſs. But to what purpoſe is it, that theſe things are equally revealed to both, (as the light is equally revealed to all blind men) if they be not fully revealed to either? The ſenſe of this Scripture, *Why are they then baptiz'd for the dead?* and this, *He ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire*, and a thouſand others, are equally revealed to you and to another Interpreter, that is, certainly to neither. He now conceives one ſenſe of them, and you another; And would it not be an excellent Inference, if I ſhould conclude now as you do; That you forſake the formal motive of Faith, which is Gods Revelation, and conſequently loſe all Faith and Unity therein? So likewiſe the Jeſuits and Dominicans, the Franciſcans and Dominicans, diſagree about things equally revealed by Almighty God: and ſeeing they do ſo, I beſeech you let me underſtand, why this reaſon will not exclude them as well as Proteſtants *from all Faith and Unity therein?* Thus you have failed of your undertaking in your firſt part of your Title, and that is a very ill *omen*, eſpecially in points of ſo ſtreight mutual dependance, that we ſhall have but ſlender performance in your ſecond Aſſumpt. Which is, *That the Church is infallible in all her Definitions, whether concerning Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental.*

25. *Ad §.7.& 8.* The Reaſons in theſe two Paragraphs, as they were alledged before, ſo they were before anſwered, *Cap.* 2. and thither I remit the Reader.

26. *Ad §. 9, 10, 11.* I grant that the Church *cannot without damnable ſin, either deny any thing to be true, which ſhe knows to be Gods Truth*: or propoſe *any thing as his Truth, which ſhe knows not to be ſo.* But that ſhe may not do this by ignorance or miſtake, and ſo without damnable ſin, that you ſhould have proved, but have not. But, ſay you, *This excuſe cannot ſerve: for if the Church be aſſiſted only for Points Fundamental, ſhe cannot but know that ſhe may err in points not Fundamental.* Anſw. It does not follow, unleſs

unleſs you ſuppoſe, that the Church knows that ſhe is aſſiſted no farther. But if, being aſſiſted only ſo far, ſhe yet did conceive by errour her aſſiſtance abſolute and unlimited, or, if knowing her aſſiſtance reſtrained to Fundamentals, ſhe yet conceived by errour, that ſhe ſhould be guarded, from propoſing any thing but what was fundamental, then the conſequence is apparently falſe. *But at leaſt ſhe cannot be certain that ſhe cannot err, and therefore cannot be excuſed from headlong and pernicious temerity in propoſing points not fundamental, to be believed by Chriſtians as matters of Faith.* Anſ. Neither is this deduction worth any thing, unleſs it be underſtood of ſuch unfundamental points, as ſhe is not warranted to propoſe by evident Text of Scripture. Indeed, if ſhe propoſe ſuch, as *matters of Faith certainly true*, ſhe may well be queſtioned, *Quo Warranto?* She builds without a foundation, and *ſays, Thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo:* which cannot be excuſed from raſhneſs and high preſumption; ſuch a preſumption, as an Embaſſadour ſhould commit, who ſhould ſay in his Maſters name that for which he hath no Commiſſion; Of the ſame nature, I ſay, but of a higher ſtrain: as much as the King of Heaven, is greater than any earthly King. But though ſhe may err in ſome points not-fundamental, yet may ſhe have certainty enough in propoſing others; as for example, theſe, *That Abraham begat Iſaac*, that *S. Paul had a cloak*, that *Timothy was ſick*; becauſe theſe, though not Fundamental, *i. e.* no eſſential parts of Chriſtianity, yet are evidently, and undeniably ſet down in Scripture, and conſequently, may be without all raſhneſs propoſed by the Church as certain divine Revelations. Neither is your Argument, concluding, when you ſay, *If in ſuch things ſhe may be deceived, ſhe muſt be always uncertain of all ſuch things.* For, my ſenſe may ſometimes poſſibly deceive me, yet I am certain enough that I ſee what I ſee, and feel what I feel. Our Judges are not infallible in their judgments, yet are they certain enough, that they judge aright, and that they proceed according to the Evidence that is given, when they condemn a Thief, or a murderer to the Gallows. A Traveller is not always certain of his way, but often miſtaken: and doth it therefore follow that he can have no aſſurance that *Charing-croſs* is his right way from the *Temple* to *White-Hall*? The ground of your Error here is your not diſtinguiſhing between Actual Certainty and Abſolute Infallibility. Geometricians are not infallible in their own Science: yet they are very certain of thoſe things which they ſee demonſtrated. And Carpenters are not Infallible, yet certain of the ſtraightneſs of thoſe things which agree with their Rule and Square. So though the Church be not infallibly certain, that in all her Definitions, whereof ſome are about diſputable and ambiguous matters, ſhe ſhall proceed according to her Rule; yet being certain of the Infallibility of her Rule, and that in this or that thing ſhe doth manifeſtly proceed according to it, ſhe may be certain of the Truth of ſome particular Decrees, and yet not certain that ſhe ſhall never decree but what is true.

27. *Ad* §. 12. *But if the Church may err in points not fundamental, ſhe may err in propoſing Scripture, and ſo we cannot be aſſured whether ſhe have not been deceived already.* The Church may err in her Propoſition or cuſtody of the Canon of Scripture, if you underſtand by the Church, any preſent Church of one denomination; for example, the *Roman*, the *Greek*, or ſo. Yet have we ſufficient certainty of Scripture, not from the bare teſtimony

of any preſent Church, but from Univerſal Tradition, of which the teſtimony of any preſent Church is but a little part. So that here you fall into the Fallacy, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*. For in effect this is the ſenſe of your Argument: Unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty of Scripture from the Authority of the Church: Therefore unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty hereof at all. As if a man ſhould ſay, If the Vintage of *France* miſcarry, we can have no Wine from *France*: Therefore, if that Vintage miſcarry, we can have no Wine at all. And, for the incorruption of Scripture; I know no other rational aſſurance we can have of it, than ſuch as we have of the incorruption of other ancient Books, that is, the conſent of ancient Copies: ſuch, I mean *for the kind*, though it be far *greater for the degree of it*. And if the Spirit of God give any man any other Aſſurance hereof, this is not rational and diſcurſive, but ſupernatural and infuſed. An Aſſurance it may be to himſelf, but no Argument to another. As for the infallibility of the Church; it is ſo far from being a proof of Scriptures Incorruption, that no proof can be pretended for it, but incorrupted places of Scripture: which yet are as ſubject to corruption as any other, and more likely to have been corrupted (if it had been poſſible) than any other, and made to ſpeak as they do, for the advantage of thoſe men, whoſe ambition it hath been a long time, to bring all under their Authority. Now then, if any man ſhould prove the Scriptures uncorrupted, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible: I would demand again touching this very thing, That there is an Infallible Church, ſeeing it is not of it ſelf evident, how ſhall I be aſſured of it? And what can he anſwer, but that the Scripture ſays ſo, in theſe and theſe places? Hereupon I would ask him, how ſhall I be aſſured, that the Scriptures are incorrupted in theſe places? ſeeing it is poſſible, and not altogether improbable, that theſe men, which deſire to be thought Infallible, when they had the government of all things in their own hands, may have altered them for their purpoſe. If to this he anſwer again, that the Church is infallible, and therefore cannot do ſo; I hope it would be apparent, that he runs round in a circle, and proves the Scriptures incorruption, by the Churches infallibility, and the Churches infallibility, by the Scriptures incorruption; and that is in effect the Churches infallibility by the Churches infallibility, and the Scriptures incorruption by the Scriptures incorruption.

28. Now for your Obſervation, that *ſome Books, which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received for ſuch. But never any Book or Syllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards queſtioned or rejected for Apocryphal*: I demand, touching the firſt ſort, Whether they were commended to the Church by the Apoſtles as Canonical, or not? If not, ſeeing the whole Faith was preached by the Apoſtles to the Church, and ſeeing, after the Apoſtles, the Church pretends to no new Revelations, How can it be an Article of Faith to believe them Canonical? And how can you pretend, that your Church, which makes this an Article of Faith, is ſo aſſiſted as not to propoſe any thing as a Divine Truth which is not revealed by God? If they were, How then is the Church an infallible keeper of the Canon of Scripture, which hath ſuffered ſome Books of Canonical Scripture to be loſt? and others to loſe for a long time their being Canonical, at leaſt, the neceſſity of being ſo eſteemed, and afterwards, as it were by the law of *Poſtliminium* hath reſtored their Authority and Canonicalneſs

calneſs unto them? If this was delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, the point was ſufficiently diſcuſſed, and therefore your Churche's omiſſion to teach it for ſome Ages, as an Article of Faith, nay degrading it from the number of Articles of Faith, and putting it among diſputable problems, was ſurely not very laudable. If it were not revealed by God to the Apoſtles, and by the Apoſtles to the Church, then can it be no Revelation, and therefore her preſumption in propoſing it as ſuch, is inexcuſable.

19. And then for the other part of it, *that never any Book or Syllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards queſtioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* Certainly it is a bold Aſſeveration, but extremely falſe. For I demand; The Book of *Eccleſiaſticus* and *Wiſdom*, *the Epiſtle of St. James*, and *to the Hebrews*, were they by the Apoſtles approved for Canonical, or no? If not, With what face dare you approve them, and yet pretend that all your doctrin is Apoſtolical? Eſpecially, ſeeing it is evident that this point is not deducible by rational diſcourſe from any other defined by them. If they were approved by them, this, I hope, was a ſufficient definition: and therefore you were beſt rub your forehead hard, and ſay, that theſe Books were never queſtioned. But if you do ſo, then I ſhall be bold to ask you, what Books you meant in ſaying before, *Some Books which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received?* Then for the Book of *Macchabees*, I hope, you will ſay it was defined for Canonical before S. *Gregorie*'s time: and yet he, lib. 19. Moral. c. 13. citing a teſtimony out of it, prefaceth to it after this manner, *Concerning which matter we do not amiſs, if we produce a teſtimony out of Books although not Canonical, yet ſet forth for the edification of the Church. For Eleazar in the Book of Macchabees*, &c. Which, if it be not to reject it from being Canonical, is, without queſtion, at leaſt to queſtion it. Moreover, becauſe you are ſo punctual, as to talk of words and ſyllables, I would know whether before *Sixtus Quintus* his time, your Church had a defined Canon of Scripture, or not? If not, then was your Church ſurely a moſt Vigilant Keeper of Scripture, that for 1500. years had not defined what was Scripture, and what was not. If it had, then I demand, Was it *that*, ſet forth by *Sixtus?* or *that*, ſet forth by *Clement?* or a *third* different from both? If it were that ſet forth by *Sixtus*, then is it now condemned by *Clement:* if that of *Clement*, it was condemned I ſay, but ſure you will ſay contradicted and queſtioned by *Sixtus*; If different from both, then was it queſtioned and condemned by both, and ſtill lies under the condemnation. But then laſtly, Suppoſe it had been true, *That both ſome Book not known to be Canonical had been received*, and that *never any after receiving had been queſtioned*: How had this been a ſign that the Church is infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt? In what mood or figure would this Concluſion follow out of theſe Premiſſes? Certainly, your flying to ſuch poor ſigns as theſe are, is to me a great ſign, that you labour with penury of better Arguments: and that thus to catch at ſhadows and bulruſhes, is a ſhrewd ſign of a ſinking cauſe.

3. *Ad* §. 13. We are told here, *That the general promiſes of Infallibility to the Church, muſt not be reſtrained only to points Fundamental; Becauſe then the Apoſtles words and writings may alſo be ſo reſtrained.* The Argument put in form, and made compleat by ſupply of the concealed Propoſition, runs thus;

The Infallibility promiſed to the preſent Church of any Age, is as abſolute and unlimited, as that promiſed to the Apoſtles in their Preaching and Writings:

But the Apoſtles Infallibility is not to be limited to Fundamentals:

Therefore neither is the Churche's Infallibility thus to be limited.

Or thus;

The Apoſtles Infallibility in their Preaching and Writing may be limited to Fundamentals, as well as the Infallibility of the preſent Church: But that is not to be done: Therefore this alſo is not to be done.

Now to this Argument, I anſwer, that, if by *may be as well*, in the Major Propoſition, be underſtood, *may be as poſſibly*: it is true, but impertinent. If by it we underſtand, *may be as juſtly and rightly*, It is very pertinent, but very falſe. So that as D. *Potter limits the infallibility of the Preſent Church unto Fundamentals, ſo another may limit the Apoſtles unto them alſo.* He may do it *de facto*, but *de jure* he cannot; that may be done and done lawfully: this alſo may be done, but not lawfully. That may be done, and, if it be done, cannot be confuted: This alſo may be done, but, if it be done, may eaſily be confuted. It is done to our hand in this very Paragraph, by five words taken out of Scripture, *All Scripture is divinely inſpired.* Shew but as much for the Church: Shew where it is written, *That all the Decrees of the Church are divinely inſpired*; and the Controverſie will be at end. Beſides, there is not the ſame reaſon for the Churche's abſolute Infallibility, as for the Apoſtles and Scripture's. For, if the Church fall into error, it may be reformed by comparing it with the Rule of the Apoſtles Doctrine and Scripture. But, if the Apoſtles have erred in delivering the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, to whom ſhall we have recourſe, for the diſcovering and correcting their error? Again, there is not ſo much ſtrength required in the Edifice as in the Foundation: and, if but wiſe men have the ordering of the building, they will make it much a ſurer thing, that the foundation ſhall not fail the building, than that the building ſhall not fall from the foundation. And though the building be to be of Brick, or Stone, and perhaps of Wood; yet, if it may be poſſibly, they will have a Rock for their Foundation, whoſe ſtability is a much more indubitable thing, than the adherence of the ſtructure to it. Now the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Canonical Writers, are the Foundation of the Church, according to that of S. *Paul, Built upon the Foundation of Apoſtles and Prophets*; therefore their ſtability in reaſon ought to be greater then the Churche's, which is built upon them. Again, a dependant Infallibility (eſpecially if the dependance be voluntary) cannot be ſo certain as that on which it depends: But the Infallibility of the Church, depends upon the Infallibility of the Apoſtles, as the ſtraitneſs of the thing regulated, upon the ſtraitneſs of the Rule: and beſides, this dependance is voluntary; for it is in the power of the Church to deviate from this Rule; being nothing elſe but an aggregation of men, of which every one hath free-will, and is ſubject to paſſions and error: Therefore the Churche's Infallibility, is not ſo certain as that of the Apoſtles.

31. Laſtly, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* If you be ſo Infallible as the Apoſtles were, ſhew it as the Apoſtles did; *They went forth* (ſaith

(ſaith S. *Mark*) *and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming their words with Signs following.* It is impoſſible that God ſhould lye, and that the eternal Truth ſhould ſet his hand and ſeal to the confirmation of a falſhood, or of ſuch Doctrine as is partly true, and partly falſe. The Apoſtles Doctrine was thus confirmed, therefore it was intirely true, and in no part either falſe or uncertain. I ſay, in no part of that which they delivered conſtantly, as a certain divine Truth, and which had the Atteſtation of Divine Miracles. For that the Apoſtles themſelves, even after the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt, were, and, through inadvertence or prejudice, continued for a time in an errour, repugnant to a revealed Truth, it is, as I have already noted, unanſwerably evident, from the *Story of the Acts of the Apoſtles.* For notwithſtanding our Saviour's expreſs Warrant and Injunction, *To go and preach to all Nations*, yet until S. *Peter* was better informed by a Viſion from Heaven, and by the converſion of *Cornelius*; both he and the reſt of the Church, held it unlawful for them, to go or preach the Goſpel to any but the Jews.

32. And for thoſe things which they profeſs to deliver as the dictates of humane reaſon and prudence, and not as divine Revelations, why we ſhould take them to be divine Revelations, I ſee no reaſon; nor how we can do ſo, and not contradict the Apoſtles and God himſelf. Therefore when S. *Paul* ſays, in the 1. Epiſt to the *Corinth.* 7. 12. *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord*; And again, *Concerning Virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, but I deliver my judgment*: If we will pretend that the Lord did certainly ſpeak, what S. *Paul* ſpake, and that his judgment was God's commandment, ſhall we not plainly contradict S. *Paul*, and that Spirit by which he wrote? which moved him to write, as in other places, divine Revelations, which he certainly knew to be ſuch; ſo in this place, his own judgment, touching ſome things which God had not particularly revealed unto him. And, if D. *Potter* did ſpeak to this purpoſe (*that the Apoſtles were Infallible only in theſe things which they ſpake, of certain knowledg*) I cannot ſee what danger there were in ſaying ſo. Yet the Truth is, you wrong D. *Potter*. It is not he, but D. *Stapleton* in him, that ſpeaks the words you cavil at. D. *Stapleton*, ſaith he, *p.* 140. is full and punctual to this purpoſe: then ſets down the effect of his diſcourſe *l.* 8. *Princ. Doct.* 4. *c.* 15. and in that, the words you cavil at; and then *p.* 150. he ſhuts up this Paragraph with theſe words, Thus D. *Stapleton*. So that, if either the Doctrine, or the Reaſon, be not good, D. *Stapleton* not D. *Potter* is to anſwer for it.

33. Neither do D. *Potter*'s enſuing words *limit the Apoſtle's infallibility to truths abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*, if you read them with any candor: for it is evident, he grants the *Church infallible in Truths abſolutely neceſſary*; and as evident, that he *aſcribes to the Apoſtles, the Spirit's guidance, and conſequently infallibility in a more high and abſolute manner than any ſince them.* From whence, thus I argue: He that grants the Church infallible in Fundamentals, and aſcribes to the Apoſtles the infallible guidance of the Spirit, in a more high and abſolute manner than to any ſince them, limits not the Apoſtles infallibility to Fundamentals; But D. *Potter* grants to the Church ſuch a limited infallibility, and aſcribes to the Apoſtles, *the Spirit's infallible guidance in a more high and abſolute manner*; Therefore he limits not the Apoſtles infallibility to Fundamentals. I once knew a man out of courteſie help a lame dog over a ſtile, and he for requi-

tal

tal bit him by the fingers: Juſt ſo you ſerve D. *Potter*. He out of courteſie grants you, that thoſe words, *The Spirit ſhall lead you into all Truth, and ſhall abide with you ever*, though in their high and moſt abſolute ſenſe they agree only to the Apoſtles, yet in a conditional, limited, moderate, ſecundary ſenſe, they may be underſtood of the Church. But ſays, that if they be underſtood of the Church, *All, muſt not be ſimply all*, No, nor ſo large an All, as the Apoſtles all, *but all neceſſary to ſalvation*. And you, to requite his courteſie in granting you thus much, cavil at him, as if he had preſcribed theſe bounds to the Apoſtles alſo, as well as the preſent Church. Whereas, he hath explained himſelf to the contrary, both in the clauſe fore-mentioned, *The Apoſtles, who had the Spirit's guidance in a more high and abſolute manner than any ſince them*; and in theſe words enſuing, *whereof the Church is ſimply ignorant*; and again, *wherewith the Church is not acquainted*. But moſt clearly in thoſe which being moſt incompatible to the Apoſtles, you with an *&c*, I cannot but fear, craftily have concealed: *How many obſcure Texts of Scripture which ſhe underſtands not? How many School-Queſtions which ſhe hath not, happily cannot determine? And for matters of fact, it is apparent that the Church may err*; and then concludes, *That we muſt underſtand by All truths, not ſimply All, But* (if you conceive the words as ſpoken of the Church) *All Truth abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*. And yet, beyond all this, the negative part of his anſwer agrees very well to the Apoſtles themſelves; for that *All which they were lead into*, was not ſimply All, otherwiſe S. *Paul* erred in ſaying, *we know in part*; but ſuch an All as was requiſite to make them the Churches Foundations. Now ſuch they could not be, without freedom from errour in all thoſe things which they delivered conſtantly, as certain revealed Truths. For, if we once ſuppoſe they may have erred in ſome things of this nature, it will be utterly undiſcernable what they have erred in, and what they have not. Whereas though we ſuppoſe the Church hath erred in ſome things, yet we have means to know, what ſhe hath erred in, and what ſhe hath not. I mean by comparing the Doctrine of the preſent Church, with the Doctrin of the Primitive Church delivered in Scripture. But then, laſt of all, ſuppoſe the *Doctor* had ſaid (which I know he never intended) that this promiſe in this place made to the Apoſtles, was to be underſtood only of Truths abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; Is it conſequent that he makes their Preaching and Writing not infallible in Points not Fundamental? Do you not bluſh for ſhame at this Sophiſtry? The Doctor ſays, no more was promiſed in this place; Therefore he ſays no more was promiſed! Are there not other places beſides this? And may not that be promiſed in other places, which is not promiſed in this?

34. *But, if the Apoſtles were Infallible in all things propoſed by them as Divine Truths, the like muſt be affirmed of the Church, becauſe D.* Potter *teacheth the ſaid promiſe to be verified in the Church.* True, he doth ſo, but not in ſo abſolute a manner. Now what is oppoſed to Abſolute, but Limited, or reſtrained? To the Apoſtles then it was made, and to them only, yet the words are true of the Church. And this very promiſe might have been made to it, though here it is not. They agree to the Apoſtles *in a higher*, to the Church *in a lower* ſenſe: to the Apoſtles *in a more abſolute*, to the Church *in a more limited* ſenſe. To the Apoſtles *abſolutely* for *the Churches direction*: to the Church *Conditionally by adherence to that direction, and ſo*

far

far as she doth adhere to it. In a word, the Apostles were lead into all Truths by the Spirit, *efficaciter*: The Church is led also into all Truth by the Apostles *writings*, *sufficienter*. So that the Apostles and the Church, may be fitly compared to the Star and the Wisemen. The Star was directed by the finger of God, and could not but go right to the place where Christ was: But the Wisemen were led by the Star to Christ; led by it, I say, not *efficaciter* or *irresistibiliter*, but *sufficienter*, so that if they would, they might follow it; if they would not, they might chuse. So was it between the Apostles writing Scriptures, and the Church. They in their writing were infallibly assisted to propose nothing as a divine Truth, but what was so. The Church is also led into all Truth, but it is by the intervening of the Apostles writings: But it is as the Wisemen were led by the Star, or as a Traveller is directed by a Mercurial Statue, or as a Pilot by his Card and Compass: led sufficiently, but not irresistibly: led as that she may follow, not so that she must. For, seeing the Church is a Society of men, whereof every one (according to the Doctrin of the *Romish* Church) hath freewill in believing, it follows, that the whole Aggregate hath freewill in believing. And if any man say that at least *it is morally impossible, that of so many whereof all may believe aright, not any should do so*: I answer, It is true, if they did all give themselves any liberty of judgment. But if all (as the case is here) captivate their understandings to one of them, all are as likely to err as that one. And he more likely to err than any other, because he may err and thinks he cannot, and because he conceives the Spirit absolutely promised to that succession of Bishops, of which many have been notoriously and confessedly wicked men, *Men of the World*: whereas this Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because he seeth him not, neither knoweth him.* Besides, let us suppose, that neither in this nor in any other place, God had promised any more unto them, but to lead them into all Truth, necessary for their own and other mens salvation: Doth it therefore follow that they were, *de facto*, led no farther? God indeed is obliged by his Veracity to do all that he hath promised, but is there any thing that binds him to do no more? May not he be better than his word, but you will quarrel at him? May not his Bounty exceed his Promise? And may not we have certainty enough that oft-times it doth so? God at first did not promise to *Solomon*, in his vision at *Gibeon*, any more than what he askt, which was *wisdom to govern his people*, and that he gave him. But yet, I hope, you will not deny that we have certainty enough that he gave him something which neither God had promised, nor he had asked. If you do, you contradict God himself: For *Behold* (saith God) *because thou hast asked this thing, I have done according to thy word. Lo, I have given thee a Wise and an Understanding heart, so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee. And I have also given thee that which thou hast not asked, both riches, and honour, so that there shall not be any among the Kings like unto thee in all thy days.* God, for ought appears, never obliged himself by promise, to shew *S. Paul* those *Unspeakable mysteries*, which in the third Heaven he shewed unto him: and yet, I hope, we have certainty enough, that he did so. God promises to those that *seek his Kingdom, and the righteousness thereof, that all things necessary shall be added unto them*; and in rigour by his promise he is obliged to do no more, and, if he give them necessaries he hath discharged his obligation:

obligation: Shall we therefore be ſo injurious to his bounty towards us, as to ſay it is determined by the narrow bounds of meer Neceſſity? So, though God had obliged himſelf by promiſe to give his Apoſtles infallibility only in things neceſſary to ſalvation; nevertheleſs it is utterly inconſequent, that he gave them no more, than by the rigour of his promiſe he was engaged to do; or that we can have no aſſurance of any farther aſſiſtance that he gave them: eſpecially when he himſelf, both by his word, and by his works, hath aſſured us, that he did aſſiſt them farther. You ſee by this time that your chain of *fearful conſequences* (as you call them) is turned to a rope of ſand, and may eaſily be avoided without any flying to your imaginary infallibility of the Church in all her propoſals.

35. *Ad Q.* 14. *&* 15 *Doubting of a Book received for Canonical*, may ſignifie, either doubting whether it be Canonical; or ſuppoſing it to be Canonical, whether it be True. If the former ſenſe were yours, I muſt then again diſtinguiſh of the term, *Received*; For it may ſignifie, *either received by ſome particular Church*, or by the *preſent Church Univerſal*, or *the Church of all Ages*. If you meant the word in either of the former ſenſes, that which you ſay is not true. A man may juſtly and reaſonably doubt of ſome Texts, or ſome Book received by ſome particular Church, or by the Univerſal Church of this preſent time, whether it be Canonical or no: and yet have juſt reaſon to believe, and no reaſon to doubt, but that other Books are Canonical. As *Euſebius* perhaps had reaſon to doubt of the Epiſtle of S. *James*; the Church *Rome*, in *Hieromes* time, of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. And yet they did not doubt of all the Books of the Canon, nor had reaſon to do ſo. If by *Received*, you mean *Received by the Church of all Ages*, I grant, he that doubts of any one ſuch Book, hath as much reaſon to doubt of all. But yet here again I tell you, that it is poſſible a man may doubt of one ſuch Book, and yet not of all: becauſe it is poſſible men may do not according to reaſon. If you meant your words in the latter ſenſe; then I confeſs, he that believes ſuch a Book to be Canonical, *i. e.* the word of God, and yet (to make an impoſſible Suppoſition) believes it is not to be true, if he will do according to reaſon, muſt doubt of all the reſt, and believe none. For there being no greater reaſon to believe any thing true, than becauſe God hath ſaid it, nor no other reaſon to believe the Scripture to be true, but only becauſe it is Gods word; he that doubts of the Truth of any thing ſaid by God, hath as much reaſon to believe nothing that he ſayes: and therefore, if he will do according to reaſon, neither muſt nor can believe any thing he ſayes. And upon this ground you conclude rightly, that *the infallibility of true Scripture muſt be Univerſal, and not confined to Points Fundamental.*

36. And this Reaſon why we ſhould not refuſe to believe any part of Scripture, upon pretence that the matter of it is not Fundamental, you confeſs to be convincing. *But the ſame reaſon you ſay is as convincing for the Univerſal infallibility of the Church. For* (ſay you) *unleſs She be infallible in all things, we cannot believe her in any one.* But by this reaſon your Proſelytes, knowing you are not infallible in all things, muſt not, nor cannot believe you in any thing. Nay you your ſelf muſt not believe your ſelf in any thing, becauſe you know that you are not infallible in all things. Indeed if you had ſaid *We could not rationally believe her for her own ſake, and upon her own word and authority in any thing*, I ſhould willingly grant the conſequence. For an authority ſubject to errour can be no firm or ſtable foundation of my belief

belief in any thing: and if it were in any thing, then this authority being one and the same in all proposals, I should have the same reason to believe all, that I have to believe one: and therefore must either do unreasonably in believing any one thing, upon the sole warrant of this authority; or unreasonably, in not believing all things equally warranted by it. Let this therefore be granted; and what will come of it? *Why then*, you say, *we cannot believe her in propounding Canonical Books.* If you mean still (as you must do unless you play the Sophister) *not upon her own Authority*, I grant it: For we believe Canonical Books not upon the *Authority of the present Church*, but upon *Universal Tradition.* If you mean, *Not at all*, and that with reason we cannot believe these Books to be Canonical, which the Church proposes, I deny it. There is no more consequence in the Argument than in this, The devil is not infallible, therefore if he says there is one God, I cannot believe him. No Geometrician is Infallible in all things, therefore not in these things which he demonstrates. M. *Knot* is not infallible in all things, therefore he may not believe that he wrote a Book entituled, *Charity Maintained.*

37. But *though the Reply be good, Protestants cannot make use of it, with any good coherence to this distinction, and some other Doctrins of theirs: because they pretend to be able to tell what points are Fundamental and what not; and therefore though they should believe Scripture erroneous in others, yet they might be sure it erred not in these.* To this I answer. That if without dependance on Scripture, they did know what were Fundamental, and what not, they might possibly believe the Scripture true in Fundamentals, and erroneous in other things. But seeing they ground their belief, that *such and such things only are Fundamentals*, only upon *Scripture*, and goe about to prove their assertion true, only by Scripture, then must they suppose the Scripture true absolutely and in all things, or else the Scripture could not be a sufficient warrant to them, to believe this thing, that these only Points are Fundamental. For who would not laugh at them if they should argue thus, The Scripture is true in something; the Scripture says that these Points only are Fundamental, therefore this is true, that these only are so! For every Fresh-man in Logick knows, that from meer particulars nothing can be certainly concluded. But on the other side, this reason is firme, and demonstrative, The Scripture is true in all things; But the Scripture says, that these only Points are the Fundamentals of Christian Religion; therefore it is true, that these only are so. So that the knowledge of Fundamentals being it self drawn from Scripture, is so far from warranting us to believe the Scripture is, or may be, in part True, and in part False; that it self can have no foundation, but the Universal truth of Scripture. For, to be a Fundamental Truth, presupposes to be a Truth; now I cannot know any Doctrin to be a Divine and supernatural Truth, or a true part of Christianity, but only because the Scripture says so which is all true: Therefore, much more can I not know it to be a Fundamental Truth.

38. *Ad* §. 16. To this Paragraph I answer. Though, the Church being not infallible, I cannot believe her in every thing she says; yet I can and must believe her in every thing she proves, either by Scripture, Reason, or Universal Tradition, be it Fundamental, or be it not Fundamental. This you say, we *cannot in Points not Fundamental, because in such we believe she may erre.* But this I know, we can: because though she may erre in some things,

yet

yet she does not erre in what she proves, though it be not Fundamental. Again you say, *We cannot do it in Fundamentals, because we must know what Points be Fundamental, before we go to learn of her.* Not so. But seeing Faith comes by Hearing, and by hearing those who give testimony to it which none doth but the Church and the Parts of it; I must learn of the Church, or of some part of it, or I cannot know any thing Fundamental or not Fundamental. For how can I come to know, that there was such a man as Christ, that he taught such Doctrin, that he and his Apostles did such Miracles in Confirmation of it, that the Scripture is GOD's Word, unless I be taught it? So then, the Church is, though *not a certain Foundation and proof of my Faith, yet a necessary Introduction to it.*

39. But the *Churches infallible Direction, extending only to Fundamentals, unless I know them before I go to learn of her, I may be rather deluded than instructed by her.* The reason and connexion of this consequence, I fear neither I nor you do well understand. And besides, I must tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you, *That the Church is an Infallible Director in Fundamentals.* For if she were so, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also *learn of her what is Fundamental, and take all for Fundamental which she delivers to be such.* In the performance whereof, if I knew any one Church to be Infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But, good Sir, you must needs do us this favour, to be so acute, as to distinguish between being *infallible in Fundamentals*, and being an *infallible Guide in Fundamentals.* That there shall be alwaies *a Church infallible in Fundamentals*, we easily grant; for it comes to no more but this, *that there shall be alwais a Church.* But that there shall be alwaies such a Church, which is an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, this we deny. For this cannot be without setling a known Infallibility in some one known Society of Christians, (as the *Greek* or the *Roman*, or some other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentals. A man that were destitute of all means of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet, in himself, and to himself, be infallible; but he could not be a Guide to others. A Man or a Church that were invisible, so that none could know how to repair to it for direction, could not be an infallible Guide, and yet he might be in himself infallible. You see then, there is a wide difference between these two, and therefore I must beseech you not to confound them, nor to take the one for the other.

40. But they that *know what Points are Fundamental, otherwise than by the Churches Authority, learn not of the Church*: Yes, they may learn of the Church, that the Scripture is the Word of God, and from the Scripture, that such Points are Fundamental, others are not so; and consequently learn, even of the Church, even of your Church, that all is not Fundamental, nay all is not true, which the Church teacheth to be so. Neither do I see what hinders, but a man may learn of a Church, how to confute the errors of that Church which taught him: as well as of my Master in Physick, or the Mathematicks, I may learn those rules and principles, by which I may confute my Master's erroneous Conclusions.

41. But you ask, *If the Church be not an Infallible Teacher, why are we commanded to hear, to seek, to obey the Church?* I answer. For Commands *to seek the Church*, I have not yet met with any; and, I believe, you, if you were to shew them, would be your self to seek. But yet, if you could produce

duce ſome ſuch, we might ſeek the Church to many good purpoſes, without ſuppoſing her *a Guide infallible*. And then for *hearing and obeying the Church*, I would fain know, Whether none may be heard and obeyed, but thoſe that are Infallible? Whether particular Churches, Governors, Paſtors, Paretns be not to be heard and obeyed? Or whether all theſe be infallible. I wonder you will thruſt upon us ſo often, theſe worn-out Objections, without taking notice of their Anſwers.

42. Your Argument from S. *Auſtines* firſt place, is a Fallacy, *A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*. If the *whole Church practiſe any of theſe things*, (*matters of order and decency*, for ſuch only there he ſpeaks of,) *to diſpute whether that ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs*. And from hence you inferr, *If the whole Church practiſe any thing, to diſpute whether it ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs*. As if there were no difference between *any thing*, and *any of theſe things?* Or, as if I might not eſteem it pride and folly, to contradict and diſturb the Church for matter of order, pertaining to the time and place, and other circumſtances, of Gods worſhip; and yet account it neither pride nor folly, to go about to reform ſome errors, which the Church hath ſuffered to come in, and to vitiate the very ſubſtance of Gods worſhip. It was a practice of the whole Church in S. *Auſtines* time, and eſteemed an Apoſtolique Tradition, even by Saint *Auſtin* himſelf, *That the Euchariſt ſhould be adminiſtred to Infants*: Tell me, Sir, I beſeech you; Had it been inſolent madneſs to diſpute againſt this practice, or had it not? If it had, how inſolent and mad are you, that have not only diſputed againſt it, but utterly aboliſhed it? If it had not, then, as I ſay, you muſt underſtand Saint *Auſtines* words, not ſimply of all things; but (as indeed he himſelf reſtrained them) *of theſe things, of matter of Order, Decency, and Uniformity*.

43. In the next place, you tell us out of him, *That that which hath been alwaies kept, is moſt rightly eſteemed to come from the Apoſtles*: Very right, and what then? Therefore the Church cannot erre in defining of Controverſies. Sir, I beſeech you, when you write again, do us the favour to write nothing but Syllogiſms: for I find it ſtill an extreame trouble to find out the concealed Propoſitions, which are to connect the parts of your Enthymems. As now for example, I profeſs unto you, I am at my wits end, and have done my beſt endeavour, to finde ſome glue, or ſodder, or cement, or chain, or thred, or any thing to tye this antecedent and this conſequent together, and at length am enforced to give it over, and cannot do it.

44. But the Doctrines, That *Infants are to be baptized, and, thoſe that are baptized by Heretiques, are not to re-baptized, are neither of them to be proved by Scripture: And yet according to S. Auſtine they are true Doctrines, and we may be certain of them upon the Authority of the Church, which we could not be, unleſs the Church were Infallible; therefore the Church is infallible*. I anſwer, that there is no repugnance but we may be certain enough, of the Univerſal Traditions of the ancient Church; ſuch, as in S. *Auſtins* account, theſe were which here are ſpoken of, and yet not be certain enough, of the definitions of the preſent Church. Unleſs you can ſhew (which I am ſure you can never do) that the Infallibility of the preſent Church, was alwaies a Tradition of the Ancient Church. Now your main buſineſs is to prove the preſent Church infallible, not ſo much in conſigning ancient Tradition, as in defining emergent Controverſies. Again, it follows not, becauſe

the Churches Authority is warrant enough for us to believe ſome Doctrin, touching which the Scripture is ſilent; therefore it is Warrant enough to believe theſe, to which the Scripture ſeems repugnant. Now the Doctrines, which S. *Auſtin* received upon the Churches Authority, were of the firſt ſort; the Doctrines for which we deny your Churches Infallibility, are of the ſecond. And therefore though the Churches Authority might be ſtrong enough to bear the weight which S. *Auſtin* laid upon it, yet haply it may not be ſtrong enough, to bear that which you lay upon it. Though it may ſupport ſome Doctrines without Scripture, yet ſurely not againſt it. And laſt of all, to deal ingenuouſly with You and the World, I am not ſuch an Idolater of S. *Auſtin*, as to think a thing proved ſufficiently becauſe he ſays it, nor that all his ſentences are Oracles; and particularly in this thing, that, whatſoever was practiſed or held by the Univerſal Church of his time, muſt needs have come from the Apoſtles. Though, conſidering the neerneſs of his time to the Apoſtles, I think it a good probable way, and therefore am apt enough to follow it, when I ſee no reaſon to the contrary. Yet, I profeſs, I muſt have better ſatisfaction, before I can induce my my ſelf to hold it certain and infallible. And this, not becauſe Popery would come in at this door, as ſome have vainly feared, but becauſe by the Church Univerſal of ſome time, and the Church Univerſal of other times, I ſee plain contradictions held and practiſed. Both which could not come from the Apoſtles; for then the Apoſtles had been teachers of falſhood. And therefore the belief or practice of the preſent Univerſal Church, can be no infallible proof, that the Doctrine ſo believed, or the Cuſtom ſo practiſed, came from the Apoſtles. I inſtance in the Doctrine of the *Milleneries*, and the *Euchariſts neceſsity for Infants*: both which Doctrines have been taught by the conſent of the eminent Fathers of ſome Ages, without any oppoſition from any of their Contemporaries: and were delivered by them, not as Doctors, but as Witneſſes, not as their own opinions, but as Apoſtolike Traditions. And therefore meaſuring the Doctrin of the Church by all the Rules which Cardinal *Perron* gives us for that purpoſe, both theſe Doctrins muſt be acknowledged to have been the Doctrins of the ancient Church of ſome Age or Ages; And that the contrary Doctrines were Catholique at ſome other time, I believe you will not think it needful for me to prove. So that either I muſt ſay, the Apoſtles were Fountains of contradictious Doctrines, or that being the Univerſal Doctrin of the preſent Church, is no ſufficient proof that it came originally from the Apoſtles. Beſides, who can warrant us, that the Univerſal Traditions of the Church were all Apoſtolical? ſeeing in that famous place for Traditions, in *Tertullian*, (a) *Quicunque Traditor*, *Any Author whatſoever* is Founder good enough for them. And who can ſecure us that Humane inventions, and ſuch as came *à quocunque Traditore* might not in a ſhort time, gain the reputation of Apoſtolique! Seeing the Direction, then was, (b) *Præcepta majorum Apoſtolicæs Traditiones quiſque exiſtimat.*

(a) *De Corona Militis, c. 3. & 4.* Where having recounted ſundry unwritten Traditions then obſerved by Chriſtians, many whereof, by the way, (notwithſtanding the Counſel of *Trents* profeſſion, *To receive them and the written Word with like affection of Pie-ty*) are now rejected and neglected by the Church of *Rome*: For example, *Immerſion in Baptiſm, Taſting a mixture of milk and honey preſently after; Abſtaining from Baths for a week after; Accounting it an impiety to pray kneeling on the Lord's Day, or between Eaſter and Pentecoſt*: I ſay, having reckoned up theſe and other Traditions in *Chap* 3. He adds another in the 4. of *the Veiling of Women*; And then adds, *Since I find no law for this, it follows, that Tradition muſt have given this obſervation to cuſtom, which ſhall gain in time, Apoſtolique Authority by the interpretation of the reaſon of it. By theſe examples therefore it is declared, That the obſerving of unwritten Tradition, being confirmed by cuſtom, may be defended. The perſeverance of the obſervation being a good teſtimony of the goodneſs of the Tradition. Now Cuſtom even in civil affairs where a Law is wanting, paſſeth for a Law. Neither is it material, on which it is grounded, Scripture or reaſon, ſeeing reaſon is commendation enough for a Law. Moreover, if Law be grounded on reaſon, all that muſt be Law, which is ſo grounded*——A quocunque productum——*Whoſoever is the producer of it. Do ye think it is not lawful,* Omni fideli, *for every faithful man to conceive and conſtitute? Provided he conſtitute only what is not repugnant to Gods will, what is conducible for diſcipline, and available to ſalvation? ſeeing the Lord ſays, Why even of our ſelves judge ye not what is right?* And a little after, *This reaſon now demand, ſaving the reſpect of the Tradition*—A quocunque Traditore cenſetur, nec Authorem reſpiciens ſed Authoritatem: *From whatſoever Tradition it comes, neither regard the Author but the Authority.* (b) *Hier.*

45. No leſs, you ſay, is S. *Chryſoſtom, for the infallible Traditions of the Church.* But you were to prove the Church infallible, not in her Traditions (which we willingly grant, if they be as Univerſal as the Tradition of the undoubted Books of Scripture is, to be as infallible as the Scripture is; for neither doth being written make the Word of God, the more infallible, nor being unwrittten make it the leſs infallible:) Not therefore in her Univerſal Traditions, were you to prove the Church infallible, but in all her Decrees and definitions of Controverſies. To this Point when you ſpeak, you ſhall have an Anſwer; but hitherto you do but wander.

46. But let us ſee what S. *Chryſoſtom* ſays, *They* (the Apoſtles) *delivered not all things in writing,* (who denies it?) *but many things alſo without writing* (who doubts of it?) *and theſe alſo are worthy of belief.* Yes, if we knew what they were. But many things are worthy of belief, which are not neceſſary to be believed: As, that *Julius Cæſar* was Emperour of *Rome* is a thing worthy of belief, being ſo well teſtified as it is, but yet it is not neceſſary to be believed; a man may be ſaved without it. Thoſe many works which *our Saviour did* (which S. *John* ſuppoſes, *would not have been contained in a world of Books*) if they had been written, or if God by ſome other means had preſerved the knowledge of them, had been as worthy to be believed, and as neceſſary, as thoſe that are written. But to ſhew you how much more a faithful keeper Records are than Report, thoſe few that were written are preſerved & believed; thoſe infinitely more that were not written are all loſt and vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And ſeeing God in his Providence hath not thought fit to preſerve the memory of them, he hath freed us from the Obligation of believing them: for every Obligation ceaſeth, when it becomes impoſſible. Who can doubt but the Primitive Chriſtians, to whom the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles were written, either of themſelves underſtood, or were inſtructed by the Apoſtles, touching the ſenſe of the obſcure places of them? Theſe Traditive Interpretations, had they been written and diſperſed, as the Scriptures were, had without queſtion been preſerved, as the Scriptures are. But to ſhew how excellent a Keeper of the Tradition, the Church of *Rome* hath been, or even the Catholique Church, for want of writing they are all loſt, nay were all loſt, within a few ages after Chriſt. So that if we conſult the Ancient Interpreters, we ſhal hardly find any two of them agree about the ſenſe of any one of them. *Cardinal Perron*, in his Diſcourſe of Traditions, having alledged this place for them, *Hold the Traditions*, &c. tells us, We *muſt not anſwer that S.* Paul *ſpeaks here, only of ſuch Traditions, which (though not in this Epiſt. to the Theſſ. yet) were afterwards written, and in other Books of Scripture: becauſe it is upon occaſion of Tradition* (touching the *cauſe* of the *hinderance of the coming of Antichriſt*) *which was never written, that he lays this injunction upon them, to hold the Traditions.* Well, let us grant this Argument good, and concluding; and that the Church of the *Theſſalonians*, or the Catholique Church (for what S. *Paul* writ to one Church, he writ to all) were to hold ſome unwritten Traditions, and among the reſt, what was the cauſe of the hinderance of the coming of Antichriſt. But what if they did not perform their duty in this point, but ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt out of the memory of the Church? Shal we not conclude, that ſeeing God would not ſuffer any thing neceſſary to Salvation to be loſt, and he hath ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt, therefore the knowledge

or belief of it, though it were a profitable thing, yet it was not neceſſary? I hope you will not challenge ſuch Authority over us, as to oblige us to impoſſibilities, to do that which you cannot do your ſelves. It is therefore requiſite that you make this command poſſible to be obeyed, before you require obedience unto it. Are you able then to inſtruct us ſo well, as to be fit to ſay unto us, *Now ye know what witholdeth?* Or, do you your ſelves know that ye may inſtruct us? Can ye, or dare you ſay, this or this was this hinderance which S. *Paul* here meant, and all men under pain of damnation are to believe it? Or if you cannot, (as I am certain you cannot) go then, and vaunt your Church, for the only Watchful, Faithful, Infallible Keeper of the Apoſtles Traditions; when here this very Tradition, which here in particular was depoſited with the *Theſſalonians* and the Primitive Church, you have utterly loſt it, ſo that there is no footſtep or print of it remaining, which with Divine Faith we may rely upon. Bleſſed therefore be the goodneſs of God, who, ſeeing that what was not written, was in ſuch danger to be loſt, took order, that what was neceſſary ſhould be written! Saint *Chryſoſtom*'s counſel therefore, of *accounting the Churches Traditions worthy of belief*, we are willing to obey: And, if you can of any thing make it appear, that *it is Tradition*, we will ſeek no farther. But this we ſay withall, that we are perſwaded you cannot make this appear in any thing, but *only the Canon of Scripture*; and that there is nothing now extant, and to be known by us, which can put in ſo good plea, to be the unwritten Word of God, as the unqueſtioned Books of Canonical Scripture, to be the written Word of God.

47. You conclude this Paragraph with a ſentence of S. *Auſtins*, who ſays, *The Church doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor do, theſe things which are againſt Faith or good life*: and from hence you conclude, *That it never hath done ſo, nor ever can do ſo.* But though the argument hold in Logick *à non poſſe, ad non eſſe*, yet I never heard, that it would hold back, *à non eſſe, ad non poſſe.* The Church cannot do this, therefore it does not, follows with good conſequence: but The Church doth not this, therefore it ſhall never do it, nor can never do it, this, I believe, will hardly follow. In the Epiſtle next before to the ſame *Januarius*, writing of the ſame matter, he hath theſe words, *It remains, that the thing you enquire of, muſt be of that third kind of things, which are different in divers places. Let every one therefore do, that which he finds done in the Church to which he comes; for none of them is againſt Faith or good manners.* And why do you not infer from hence, that *no particular Church can bring up any Cuſtom that is againſt Faith or good manners?* Certainly this Conſequence hath as good reaſon for it as the former. If a man ſay of the Church of *England*, (what S. *Auſtin* of the Church) that ſhe neither approves, nor diſſembles, nor doth any thing againſt Faith or good manners, would you collect preſently, that this man did either make or think the Church of *England* infallible? Furthermore, it is obſervable out of this, and the former Epiſtle, that this Church, *which did not* (as S. *Auſtin*, according to you, thought) *approve or diſſemble, or do any thing againſt faith or good life*, did yet tolerate and diſſemble vain ſuperſtitions, and humane preſumptions, and ſuffer all places to be full of them, and to be exacted, as, nay more ſeverely than, the Commandments of God himſelf. This Saint *Auſtin* himſelf profeſſeth

in

in this very Epistle. *This* (saith he) *I do infinitely grieve at, that many most wholsom precepts of the divine Scripture, are little regarded; and in the mean time all is so full of so many presumptions, that he is more grievously found fault with, who during his octaves, toucheth the earth with his naked fooot, then he that shall bury his soul in drunkennes.* Of these he sayes, *That they were neither contained in Scripture, decreed by Councels, nor corroborated by the Custom of the Universal Church. And though not against Faith, yet unprofitable burdens of Christian liberty, which made the condition of the Jews more tolerable then that of Christians.* And therefore he professeth of them, *Approbare non possum, I cannot approve them.* And, *Ubi facultas tribuitur, resecanda existimo; I think they are to be cut off, whereseever we have power.* Yet so deeply were they rooted, and spread so far, through the indiscreet devotion of the people, alwayes more prone to superstition than true piety, and through the connivence of the Governors, who should have strangled them at their birth, that himself, though he grieved at them, and could not allow them, yet for fear of offence he durst not speak against them, *Multa hujusmodi, propter nonnullarum vel sanctarum vel turbulentarum personarum scandala devitanda, liberius improbare non audeo. Many of these things for fear of scandalizing many holy persons, or provoking those that are turbulent, I dare not freely disallow.* Nay, the Catholique Church it self, did see and dissemble, and tolerate them; for these are the things of which he presently says after, *The Church of God* (and you will have him speak of the true Catholique Church) *placed between Chaff and Tares, tolerates many things.* Which was directly against the command of the holy Spirit, given the Church by S. *Paul, To stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made her free, and not to suffer her self to be brought in bondage to these servile burdens.* Our Saviour tels the Scribes and Pharisees, *That in vain they worshipped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Commandments: For that laying aside the Commandments of God, they held the Traditions of men, as the washing of pots, and cups, and many other such like things.* Certainly, that which S. *Austin* complains of, as the general fault of Christians of his time, was parallel to this: *Multa* (saith he) *quæ in divinis libris saluberrimè præcepta sunt, minus curantur*; This, I suppose, I may very well render in our Saviour's words, *The Commandments of God are laid aside*; And then, *Tam multis præsumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia, All things, or all places, are so full of so many presumptions, and those exacted with such severity, nay with Tyranny, that he was more severly censured, who in the time of his Octaves touched the earth with his naked feet, than he which drowned and buried his soul in drink.* Certainly, if this be not *to teach for Doctrines mens Commandments*, I know not what is. And therefore these superstitious Christians might be said *to worship God in vain*, as well as the Scribes and Pharises. And yet great variety of superstitions of this kind, were then already spread over the Church, being different in divers places. This is plain from these words of S. *Austin* concerning them, *Diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliter variantur*; and apparent, because the stream of them was grown so violent, that he durst not oppose it, *Liberiùs improbare non audeo, I dare not freely speak against them.* So that to say the Catholique Church tolerated all this, and for fear of offence, durst not abrogate or condemn it, is to say (if we judge rightly of it) that the Church with silence and connivence generally tolerated Christians to *worship God in vain.* Now

how this tolerating of Universal superstition in the Church, can consist with the assistance and direction of Gods omnipotent Spirit to guard it from superstition, and with the accomplishment of that pretended Prophecy of the Church, *I have set Watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night*; Besides, how these Superstitions being thus nourished, cherished, and strengthened by the practice of the most, and urged with great violence upon others as the Commandments of God, and but fearfully opposed or contradicted by any, might in time take such deep root, and spread their branches so far, as to pass for Universal Customs of the Church, he that does not see, sees nothing. Especially, considering the catching and contagious nature of this sin, and how fast ill weeds spread, and how true and experimented that Rule is of the Historian, *Exempla non consistunt ubi incipiunt, sed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem latissimè evagandi sibi faciunt potestatem.* Nay, that some such superstition had not already even in S. *Austin*'s time, prevailed so far, as to be *Consuetudine universæ Ecclesiæ roboratum*, Who can doubt that considers, that the practice of *Communicating Infants*, had even then got the credit and authority, not only of an universal Custom, but also of an Apostolique Tradition.

48. But (you will say) notwithstanding all this, S. *Austin here warrants us, that the Church can never either approve, or dissemble, or practise any thing against Faith or good life, and so long you may rest securely upon it.* Yea, but the same S. *Austin* tels us in the same place, *That the Church may tolerate humane presumptions, and vain superstitions, and those urged more severely than the Commandments of God:* And whether superstition be a sin or no, I appeal to our Saviour's words before cited, and to the consent of your Schoolmen. Besides, if we consider it rightly, we shall find, that the Church is not truly said only to tolerate these things, but rather, that a part, and far the lesser, tolerated and dissembled them in silence, and a part and a far greater, publiquely avowed and practised them, and urged them upon others with great violence, and yet continued still a part of the Church. Now why the whole Church might not continue the Church, and yet do so, as well as a part of the Church might continue a part of it, and yet do so, I desire you to inform me.

49. But now after all this ado, what if S. *Austin* says not this which is pretended of the Church, *viz. That she neither approves, nor dissembles, nor practises any thing against Faith or good life*, but only of good men in the Church? Certainly, though some Copies read as you would have it, yet you should not have dissembled, that others read the place otherwise, *viz. Ecclesia multa tolerat; & tamen quæ sunt contra Fidem & bonam vitam, nec bonus approbat*, &c. *The Church tolerates many things, and yet what is against Faith or good life, a good man will neither approve, nor dissemble, nor practise.*

50. *Ad q.* 17. *That Abraham begat Isaac*, is a point very far from being Fundamental; and yet, I hope, you will grant, that Protestants believing Scripture to be the Word of God, may be certain enough of the truth and certainty of it. For what if they say that the Catholique Church, and much more themselves may possibly err in some unfundamental points, is it therefore consequent, they can be certain of none such? What if a wiser man than I may mistake the sense of some obscure place of *Aristotle*, may I not therefore without any arrogance or inconsequence, conceive my

self

ſelf certain that I underſtand him in ſome plain places, which carry their ſenſe before them? And then for Points Fundamental, to what purpoſe do you ſay, *That we muſt firſt know what they be, before we can be aſſured that we cannot err in underſtanding the Scriptures*; when we pretend not at all to any aſſurance that we cannot err, but only to a ſufficient certainty, that we do not err, but rightly underſtand thoſe things that are plain, whether Fundamental or not Fundamental: That *God is, and is a Rewarder of them that ſeek him*: That *there is no ſalvation but by faith in Chriſt*: That by *Repentance from dead works, and Faith in Chriſt, Remiſſion of ſins may be obtained*: That *there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Body*? Theſe we conceive both true, becauſe the Scripture ſays ſo, and Truths Fundamental, becauſe they are neceſſary parts of the Goſpel, whereof our Saviour ſays *Qui non crediderit, damnabitur*. All which we either learn from Scripture immediately, or learn of thoſe that learn it of Scripture; ſo that neither Learned nor Unlearned pretend to know theſe things independently of Scripture. And therefore in imputing this to us, you cannot excuſe your ſelf from having done us a palpable injury.

51. *Ad §.* 18. And I urge you as mainly as you urge D. *Potter* and other Proteſtants, that you tell us that all the Traditions, and all the Definitions of the Church are Fundamental points, and we cannot wreſt from you *a liſt in particular of all ſuch Traditions and Definitions*, without which, no man can tell whether or no he err in points fundamental, and be capable of Salvation; (For, I hope, erring in our fundamentals is no more excluſive of Salvation than erring in yours.) And, which is moſt lamentable, inſtead of giving us ſuch a Catalogue, you alſo fall to wrangle among your ſelves about the making of it; Some of you, as I have ſaid above, holding ſome things to be *matters of Faith*, which others deny to be ſo.

52. *Ad §.* 19. I anſwer, That theſe differences between Proteſtants concerning Errors damnable and not damnable, Truths fundamental and not-fundamental, may be eaſily reconciled. For either the Errour they ſpeak of *may be purely and ſimply involuntary*, or it may be in reſpect of the *cauſe of it voluntary*. If the cauſe of it be ſome voluntary and avoidable fault, the Error is it ſelf ſinful, and conſequently in its own nature damnable; As, if by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, by unwillingneſs to find it, by pride, by obſtinacy, by deſiring that Religion ſhould be true which ſutes beſt with my ends, by fear of mens ill opinion, or any other wordly fear, or any other wordly hope, I betray my ſelf to any error contrary to any divine revealed Truth, that Error may be juſtly ſtyled a ſin, and conſequently of it ſelf to ſuch a one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of theſe faults, but be deſirous to know the Truth, and diligent in ſeeking it, and adviſe not at all with fleſh and blood about the choice of my opinions, but only with God, and that Reaſon that he hath given me, if I be thus qualified, and yet through humane infirmity fall into error, that error cannot be damnable. Again, the party erring may be conceived either to die with contrition for all his ſins known and unknown, or without it; If he die without it, this errour, in it ſelf damnable, will be likewiſe ſo unto him: If he die with contrition (as his error can be no impediment but he may) his errour though in it ſelf damnable, to him, according to your doctrine, will not prove ſo. And therefore ſome of thoſe Authors whom you quote, ſpeaking of Errors whereunto men were betrayed, or

wherein

wherein they were kept by their Fault, or Vice, or Paſſion, (as for the moſt part men are:) Others ſpeaking of them, as errors ſimply and purely involuntary, and the effects of humane infirmity: ſome, as they were, *retracted by Contrition* (to uſe your own phraſe); others, as they were, not; no marvel though they have paſt upon them, ſome a heavier, and ſome a milder, ſome an abſolving, and ſome a condemning ſentence. The leaſt of all theſe errours, which here you mention, having malice enough too frequently mixed with it, to ſink a man deep enough into hell: and the greateſt of them all, being according to your Principles, either no fault at all, or very Venial, where there is no malice of the will conjoyned with it. And if it be, yet, as the moſt malignant poyſon will not poyſon him that receives with it a more powerful Antidote: ſo, I am confident, your own Doctrin will force you to confeſs, that whoſoever dies with Faith in Chriſt, and Contrition for all ſins known and unknown (in which heap all his ſinful errors muſt be comprized) can no more be hurt by any the moſt malignant and peſtilent error, than S. *Paul* by the Viper which he ſhook off into the fire. Now touching the *neceſsity of Repentance from dead works, and Faith in Chriſt Jeſus the Son of God, and Saviour of the World*, they all agree; and therefore you cannot deny, but they agree about all that is ſimply neceſſary. Moreover, though, if they ſhould go about to chuſe out of Scripture all theſe Propoſitions and Doctrines which integrate and make up the body of Chriſtian Religion, peradventure there would not be ſo an exact agreement amongſt them, as ſome ſay there was between the 70. Interpreters, in tranſlating the Old Teſtament; yet thus far without controverſie they do all agree, that in the Bible all theſe things are contained, and therefore, that whoſoever doth truly and ſincerely believe the Scripture, muſt of neceſſity, either in *hypotheſi*, or at leaſt in *theſi*, either *formally*, or at leaſt *virtually*, either *explicitely*, or at leaſt *implicitely*, either in *Act*, or at leaſt in *preparation of mind*, believe all things Fundamental: It being not-Fundamental, nor required of Almighty God, to believe the true ſenſe of Scripture in all places, but only that we ſhould endeavour to do ſo, and be prepared in mind to do ſo, whenſoever it ſhall be ſufficiently propounded to us. Suppoſe a man in ſome diſeaſe were preſcribed a medicine conſiſting of twenty ingredients, and he, adviſing with Phyſitians ſhould find them differing in opinion about it, ſome of them telling him, that all the ingredients were abſolutely neceſſary; ſome, that only ſome of them were neceſſary, the reſt only profitable, and requiſite *ad melius eſſe*; laſtly, ſome, that ſome only were neceſſary, ſome profitable, and the reſt ſuperfluous, yet not hurtful; yet all with one accord agreeing in this, That *the whole receipt had in it all things neceſſary* for the recovery of his health, and that, if he made uſe of it, he ſhould infallibly find it ſucceſsful: what wiſe man would not think they agreed ſufficiently for his direction to the recovery of his health? Juſt ſo, theſe Proteſtant Doctors, with whoſe diſcords you make ſuch Tragedies, agreeing in *Theſi* thus far, That the *Scripture evidently conteins all things neceſſary to Salvation*, both for matter of Faith, and of Practice, and that whoſoever believes it, and endeavours to find the true ſenſe of it, and to conform his life unto it, ſhall certainly perform all things neceſſary to Salvation, and undoubtedly be ſaved; agreeing, I ſay thus far, What matters it for the direction of men to Salvation, though they differ in opinion, touching what points are abſolutely neceſſary,

and

and what not? What Errors absolutely repugnant to Salvation, and what not? Especially considering that although they differ about the Question of the necessity of these Truths, yet for the most part they agree in this, that Truths they are, and profitable at least, though not simply necessary. And though they differ in the Question, Whether the contrary Errors be destructive of Salvation, or no: yet in this they consent, that Errors they are, and hurtful to Religion, though not destructive of Salvation. Now that which God requires of us, is this, That we should believe the Doctrins of the Gospel to be Truths, not all, necessary Truths, for all are not so; and consequently, the repugnant Errors to be falshoods: yet not all, such falshoods, as unavoidably draw with them damnation upon all that hold them; for all do not so.

53. Yea but *you say, It is very requisite we should agree upon a particular Catalogue of Fundamental points; for without such a Catalogue, no man can be assured whether or no, he hath Faith sufficient to Salvation.* This I utterly deny as a thing evidently false, and I wonder you should content your self magisterially to say so, without offering any proof of it. I might much more justly think it enough barely to deny it, without refutation, but I will not. Thus therefore I argue against it.

Without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be assured of the Truth of this Assertion, if it be true, That *the Scripture contains all necessary points of Faith*, and know that I believe explicitely all that is expreſt in Scripture, and implicitely all that is contained in them: Now he that believes all this, must of necessity believe all things necessary; Therefore without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be assured that I believe all things necessary, and consequently that my faith is sufficient.

I said, of the truth of this Assertion, *if it be true*: Because I will not here enter into the Question of the truth of it, it being sufficient for my present purpose, that it may be true, and may be believed without any dependance upon a Catalogue of Fundamentals. And therefore, if this be all your reason, to demand a particular Catalogue of Fundamentals, we cannot but think your demand unreasonable. Especially having your self expressed the cause of the difficulty of it, and that is, *Because Scripture doth deliver Divine Truths, but seldom qualifies them, or declares whether they be or be not absolutely necessary to salvation.* Yet not so seldom, but that out of it I could give you an abstract of the Essential parts of Christianity, if it were necessary, but I have shewed it not so, by confuting your reason, pretended for the necessity of it, and at this time I have no leisure to do you courtesies that are so troublesom to my self. Yet thus much I will promise, that when you deliver *a particular Catalogue of your Church-Proposals* with one hand, you shall receive a particular Catalogue of what I conceive Fundamental, with the other. For as yet, I see no such fair proceeding as you talk of, nor any performance on your own part of that which so clamorously you require on ours. For, as for the Catalogue which here you have given us, in saying, *You are obliged under pain of damnation to believe whatsoever the Catholike visible Church of Christ proposeth as revealed by Almighty God*, it is like a covey of one Partridge, or a flock of one Sheep, or a Fleet composed of one Ship, or an Army of one man. The Author of *Charity mistaken, demands a particular Catalogue of Fundamental points*; And

We

We (ſay you) *again and again demand ſuch a Catalogue*. And ſurely, If this one Propoſition, which here you think to ſtop our mouths with, be a Catalogue, yet at leaſt ſuch a Catalogue it is not, and therefore as yet you have not performed what you require. For, If to ſet down ſuch a Propoſition, wherein are comprized all points taught by us to be neceſſary to ſalvation, will ſerve you inſtead of a Catalogue, you ſhall have Catalogues enough. As, we are obliged to believe all under pain of damnation which God commands us to believe. There's one Catalogue. We are obliged under Pain of damnation, to believe all, whereof we may be ſufficiently aſſured, that Chriſt taught it his Apoſtles, his Apoſtles the Church. There's another. We are obliged under pain of damnation to believe Gods Word, and all contained in it to be true. There's a third. If theſe generalities will not ſatisfie you, but you will be importuning us to tell you in particular, what thoſe Doctrins are which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and his Apoſtles the Church, what points are contained in Gods Word: Then I beſeech you do us reaſon, and give us a particular and *exact Inventory of all your Church-propoſals, without leaving out, or adding any*, ſuch a one which all the Doctors of your Church will ſubſcribe to, and if you receive not then a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I for my part will give you leave to proclaim us Bankrupts.

54 Beſides, this deceitful generality of your Catalogue (as you call it) another main fault we find with it, that it is extreamly ambiguous; and therefore to draw you out of the Clouds, give me leave to propoſe ſome Queſtions to you concerning it. I would know therefore, whether by Believing, you mean explicitely or implicitely? If you mean implicitely, I would know, Whether your Churches Infallibility be under pain of damnation to be believed explicitely, or no? Whether any other point or points beſides this, be under the ſame penalty, to be believed explicitely, or no? and if any, what they be? I would know what you eſteem the Propoſals of the Catholike viſible Church? In particular, whether the Decree of the Pope *ex Cathedra*, that is, with an intent to oblige all Chriſtians by it, be a ſufficient and an obliging Propoſal? Whether men without danger of Damnation may examin ſuch a Decree, and, if they think they have juſt cauſe, refuſe to obey it? Whether the Decree of a Councel, without the *Pope's* Confirmation, be ſuch an obliging Propoſal, or no? Whether it be ſo in caſe there be no *Pope*, or in caſe it be doubtful who is *Pope?* Whether the Decree of a general Councel confirmed by the *Pope*, be ſuch a Propoſal, and whether he be an Heretique that thinks otherwiſe? Whether the Decree of a particular Councel confirmed by the *Pope*, be ſuch a Propoſal? Whether the General uncondemned practice of the Church for ſome Ages be ſuch a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the conſent of the moſt eminent Fathers of any Age, agreeing in the affirmation of any Doctrin, not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries, be a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the Fathers teſtifying ſuch or ſuch a Doctrin, or practice to be Tradition, or to be the Doctrin or practice of the Church, be a ſufficient aſſurance that it is ſo? Whether we be bound under pain of damnation, to believe every Text of the vulgar Bible, now authorized by the *Roman* Church, to be the true Tranſlation of the Originals of the Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles, without any the leaſt alteration? Whether they that lived when the Bible of *Sixtus* was ſet forth, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the ſame of that? And if not of that, of what Bible they were bound to believe

it?

it? Whether the Catholike visible Church be alwaies that Society of Christians which adheres to the Bishop of *Rome?* Whether every Christian, that hath ability and opportunity, be not bound to endevour to know explicitely the Proposals of the Church? Whether Implicite Faith in the Churches Veracity, will not save him that actually and explicitely disbelieves some Doctrin of the Church, not knowing it to be so; and actually believes some damnable Heresie, as that God hath the shape of a man? Whether an ignorant man be bound to believe any point to be decreed by the Church, when his Priest or ghostly Father assures him it is so? Whether his ghostly Father may not erre in telling him so, and whether any man can be obliged under pain of damnation, to believe an Errour? Whether he be bound to believe such a thing defined, when a number of Priests, perhaps ten or twenty tell him it is so? And what assurance he can have, that they neither erre, nor deceive him, in this matter? Why Implicite Faith in Christ or the Scriptures should not suffice for a mans Salvation, as well as implicite faith in the Church? Whether when you say, *Whatsoever the Church proposeth*, you mean all that ever she proposed, or that only which she now proposeth; and whether she now proposeth all that ever she did propose? Whether all the Books of Canonical Scripture were sufficiently declared to the Church to be so, and proposed as such by the Apostles? And if not, from whom the Church had this Declaration afterward? If so, whether all men ever since the Apostles time, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the Epistle of S. *James*, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to be Canonical; at least, not to disbelieve it, and believe the contrary? Lastly, why it is not sufficient for any mans Salvation to use the best means he can to inform his conscience, and to follow the direction of it? To all these demands when you have given fair and ingenuous Answers, you shall hear farther from me.

55. *Ad §.20.* At the first entrance into this Paragraph, From our own Doctrin, *That the Church cannot erre in Points necessary, it is concluded, if we are wise, we must forsake it in nothing, lest we should forsake it in something necessary.* To which I answer, First, that the supposition, as you understand it, is falsly imposed upon us, and as we understand it will do you no service. For when we say, that there shall be *a Church alwaies*, some where or other, *unerring* in *Fundamentals*, our meaning is but this, that *there shall be alwaies a Church*, to the very being whereof it is repugnant that it should erre in Fundamentals; for if it should do so, it would want the very Essence of a Church, and therefore cease to be a Church. But we never annexed this priviledge *to any one Church of any one Denomination*, as the *Greek* or the *Roman* Church: which if we had done, and set up some setled certain Society of Christians, distinguishable from all others by adhering to such a Bishop for our Guide in Fundamentals, then indeed, and then only, might you with some colour, though with no certainty, have concluded that we could not, in wisdome, *forsake this Church in any point, for fear of forsaking it in a necessary point.* But now that we say not this of any one determinate Church, which alone can perform the office of Guide or Director, but indefinitely of the Church, meaning no more but this, *That there shall be alwaies in some place or other, some Church that errs not in Fundamentals*; will you conclude from hence, that we cannot in wisdome forsake this or that, the *Roman* or the *Greek* Church, for fear of erring in Fundamentals?

56. Yea,

56. Yea, but you may ſay, (for I will make the beſt I can of all your Arguments) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentals, when* Luther *aroſe, was by our confeßion the* Roman; *and therefore we ought not in wiſdome to have departed from it in any thing.* I anſwer, Firſt, that we confeſs no ſuch thing, that the Church of *Rome* was then this Church, but only a Part of it, and that the moſt corrupted and moſt incorrigible. Secondly, that if by adhering to that Church, we could have been thus far ſecured, this Argument had ſome ſhew of reaſon. But ſeeing we are not warranted thus much by any priviledge of that Church, that She cannot erre fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which aſſures us that ſhe doth erre very haynouſly, we collect our hope, that the Truths ſhe retains and the practice of them, may prove an Antidote to her againſt the Errors which ſhe maintains in ſuch Perſons, as in ſimplicity of heart follow this *Abſalom*; we ſhould then do againſt the light of our conſcience, and ſo ſin damnably if we ſhould not abandon the profeſſion of her Errors though not Fundamental. Neither can we thus conclude, We may ſafely hold with the Church of *Rome* in all her Points, for ſhe cannot erre damnably; For this is falſ, ſhe may, though perhaps ſhe doth not: But rather thus; Theſe Points of Chriſtianity, which have in them the nature of Antidotes againſt the poyſon of all ſinnes and errors, the Church of *Rome*, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtill retains; therefore we hope ſhe errs not Fundamentally, but ſtill remains a Part of the Church. But this can be no warrant to us to think with her in all things: ſeeing the very ſame Scripture which puts us in hope ſhe errs not Fundamentally, aſſures us that in many things, and thoſe of great moment, ſhe errs very grievouſly. And theſe Errors though to them that believe them, we hope they will not be pernicious, yet the profeſſing of them againſt conſcience, could not but bring to us certain Damnation. *As for the fear of departing from ſome Fundamenal truths withall, while we depart from her errors*, Haply it might work upon us, if adhearing to her might ſecure us from it, and if nothing elſe could: But both theſe are falſe. For firſt, adhering to her in all things cannot ſecure us from erring in Fundamentals: Becauſe though *de facto* we hope ſhe doth not erre, yet we know no priviledges ſhe hath but ſhe may erre in them her ſelfe: and therefore we had need have better ſecurity hereof than her bare Authority. Then ſecondly, without dependance on her at all, we may be ſecured that we do not erre Fundamentally; I mean by believing all things plainly ſet down in Scripture, wherin all neceſſary, and moſt things profitable, are plainly delivered. Suppoſe I were travelling to *London*, and knew two wayes thither, the one very ſafe and convenient, the other very inconvenient, and dangerous, but yet a way to *London*: and that I overtook a Paſſenger on the way, who himſelf believed, and would fain perſwade me, there was no other way but the worſe, and would perſwade me to accompany him in it, becauſe I confeſſed his way, though very inconvenient, and very dangerous, yet a way; ſo that going that way we might come to our journies end by the conſent of both parties: but he believed my way to be none at all; and therefore I might juſtly fear, leſt out of a deſire of leaving the worſt way, I left the true and the only way: If now I ſhould not be more ſecure upon my own knowledge, than frighted by this fallacy, would you not beg me for a fool? Juſt ſo might you think of us, if we would be frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbear. For the only and the main reaſon why we believe you not to erre

in

in Fundamentals, is your holding the *Doctrins of Faith in Christ and Repentance*: which knowing we hold as well as you, notwithstanding our departure from you, we must needs know that we do not erre in Fundamentals, as well as we know that you in some sort do not erre in Fundamentals, and therefore cannot possibly fear the contrary. Yet let us be more liberal to you; and grant that which can never be proved, that God had said in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *shall never destroy the Foundation*, but withall had said, *that it might and would lay much hay and stubble upon it*; That you should never hold any Errour destructive of salvation, but yet many that were prejudicial to Edification: I demand, Might we have dispensed with our selves in the believing and professing these Errors in regard of the smalness of them? Or, had it not been a damnable sin to do so, though the Errors in themselves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain direction to depart from you in some things profitable, as to adhere to you in things necessary? In the beginning of your Book, when it was for your purpose to have it so, the greatness or smalness of the matter was not considerable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here we must erre with you in small things, for fear of losing your direction in greater: and for fear of departing too far from you, not go from you at all, even where we see plainly that you have departed from the Truth.

57. Beyond all this, I say, that this which you say *in wisdom we are to do*, is not only unlawful, but if we will proceed according to reason, impossible. I mean to adhere to you in all things, having no other ground for it, but because you are (as we will now suppose) infallible in some things, that is, in Fundamentals. For whether by skill in Architecture a large structure may be supported by a narrow foundation, I know not; but sure I am, in reason no Conclusion can be larger than the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I consider what I do, and be perswaded that your Infallibility is but limited, and particular; and partiall, my adherence upon this ground cannot possibly be absolute, and Universal, and Total. I am confident, that should I meet with such a man amongst you (as I am well assured there be many) that would grant your Church infallible only in Fundamentals, which what they are he knows not, and therefore upon this only reason adheres to you in all things; I say that I am confident, that it may be demonstrated, that such a man adheres to you, with a fiducial and certain assent in nothing. To make this clear (because at the first hearing it may seem strange) give me leave, good Sir, to suppose you the man, and to propose to you a few questions, and to give for you such answers to them, as upon this ground you must of necessity give, were you present with me. First, supposing you hold your Church infallible in Fundamentals, obnoxious to errour in other things, and that you know not what Points are Fundamental, I demand, C. Why do you believe the Doctrin of Transubstantiation? K. Because the Church hath taught it, which is infallible. C. What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentals? K. In Fundamentals only. C. Then in other points she may erre? K. She may. C. And do you know what Points are Fundamental, what not? K. No, and therefore I believe her in all things, lest I should disbelieve her in Fundamentals. C. How know you then, whether this be a Fundamental Point or no? K. I know not. C. It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamental Point? K. Yes, it may be so. C. And in these, you said, the Church may err? K. Yes, I did

56. Yea, but you may ſay, (for I will make the beſt I can of all your Arguments) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentals, when* Luther *aroſe, was by our confeßion the* Roman; *and therefore we ought not in wiſdome to have departed from it in any thing.* I anſwer, Firſt, that we confeſs no ſuch thing, that the Church of *Rome* was then this Church, but only a Part of it, and that the moſt corrupted and moſt incorrigible. Secondly, that if by adhering to that Church, we could have been thus far ſecured, this Argument had ſome ſhew of reaſon. But ſeeing we are not warranted thus much by any priviledge of that Church, that She cannot erre fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which aſſures us that ſhe doth erre very haynouſly, we collect our hope, that the Truths ſhe retains and the practice of them, may prove an Antidote to her againſt the Errors which ſhe maintains in ſuch Perſons, as in ſimplicity of heart follow this *Abſalom*; we ſhould then do againſt the light of our conſcience, and ſo ſin damnably if we ſhould not abandon the profeſſion of her Errors though not Fundamental. Neither can we thus conclude, We may ſafely hold with the Church of *Rome* in all her Points, for ſhe cannot erre damnably; For this is falſ, ſhe may, though perhaps ſhe doth not: But rather thus; Theſe Points of Chriſtianity, which have in them the nature of Antidotes againſt the poyſon of all ſinnes and errors, the Church of *Rome*, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtill retains; therefore we hope ſhe errs not Fundamentally, but ſtill remains a Part of the Church. But this can be no warrant to us to think with her in all things: ſeeing the very ſame Scripture which puts us in hope ſhe errs not Fundamentally, aſſures us that in many things, and thoſe of great moment, ſhe errs very grievouſly. And theſe Errors though to them that believe them, we hope they will not be pernicious, yet the profeſſing of them againſt conſcience, could not but bring to us certain Damnation. *As for the fear of departing from ſome Fundamenal truths withall, while we depart from her errors*, Haply it might work upon us, if adhearing to her might ſecure us from it, and if nothing elſe could: But both theſe are falſe. For firſt, adhering to her in all things cannot ſecure us from erring in Fundamentals: Becauſe though *de facto* we hope ſhe doth not erre, yet we know no priviledges ſhe hath but ſhe may erre in them her ſelfe: and therefore we had need have better ſecurity hereof than her bare Authority. Then ſecondly, without dependance on her at all, we may be ſecured that we do not erre Fundamentally; I mean by believing all things plainly ſet down in Scripture, wherin all neceſſary, and moſt things profitable, are plainly delivered. Suppoſe I were travelling to *London*, and knew two wayes thither, the one very ſafe and convenient, the other very inconvenient, and dangerous, but yet a way to *London*: and that I overtook a Paſſenger on the way, who himſelf believed, and would fain perſwade me, there was no other way but the worſe, and would perſwade me to accompany him in it, becauſe I confeſſed his way, though very inconvenient, and very dangerous, yet a way; ſo that going that way we might come to our journies end by the conſent of both parties: but he believed my way to be none at all; and therefore I might juſtly fear, leſt out of a deſire of leaving the worſt way, I left the true and the only way: If now I ſhould not be more ſecure upon my own knowledge, than frighted by this fallacy, would you not beg me for a fool? Juſt ſo might you think of us, if we would be frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbear. For the only and the main reaſon why we believe you not to erre

in

in Fundamentals, is your holding the *Doctrins of Faith in Christ and Repentance*: which knowing we hold as well as you, notwithstanding our departure from you, we must needs know that we do not erre in Fundamentals, as well as we know that you in some sort do not erre in Fundamentals, and therefore cannot possibly fear the contrary. Yet let us be more liberal to you, and grant that which can never be proved, that God had said in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *shall never destroy the Foundation*, but withall had said, *that it might and would lay much hay and stubble upon it*; That you should never hold any Errour destructive of salvation, but yet many that were prejudicial to Edification: I demand, Might we have dispensed with our selves in the believing and professing these Errors in regard of the smalness of them? Or, had it not been a damnable sin to do so, though the Errors in themselves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain direction to depart from you in some things profitable, as to adhere to you in things necessary? In the beginning of your Book, when it was for your purpose to have it so, the greatness or smalness of the matter was not considerable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here we must erre with you in small things, for fear of losing your direction in greater: and for fear of departing too far from you, not go from you at all, even where we see plainly that you have departed from the Truth.

57. Beyond all this, I say, that this which you say *in wisdom we are to do*, is not only unlawful, but if we will proceed according to reason, impossible. I mean to adhere to you in all things, having no other ground for it, but because you are (as we will now suppose) infallible in some things, that is, in Fundamentals. For whether by skill in Architecture a large structure may be supported by a narrow foundation, I know not; but sure I am, in reason no Conclusion can be larger than the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I consider what I do, and be perswaded that your Infallibility is but limited, and particular; and partiall, my adherence upon this ground cannot possibly be absolute, and Universal, and Total. I am confident, that should I meet with such a man amongst you (as I am well assured there be many) that would grant your Church infallible only in Fundamentals, which what they are he knows not, and therefore upon this only reason adheres to you in all things; I say that I am confident, that it may be demonstrated, that such a man adheres to you, with a fiducial and certain assent in nothing. To make this clear (because at the first hearing it may seem strange) give me leave, good Sir, to suppose you the man, and to propose to you a few questions, and to give for you such answers to them, as upon this ground you must of necessity give, were you present with me. First, supposing you hold your Church infallible in Fundamentals, obnoxious to errour in other things, and that you know not what Points are Fundamental, I demand, C. Why do you believe the Doctrin of Transubstantiation? K. Because the Church hath taught it, which is infallible. C. What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentals? K. In Fundamentals only. C. Then in other points she may erre? K. She may. C. And do you know what Points are Fundamental, what not? K. No, and therefore I believe her in all things, lest I should disbelieve her in Fundamentals. C. How know you then, whether this be a Fundamental Point or no? K. I know not. C. It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamental Point? K. Yes, it may be so. C. And in these, you said, the Church may err? K. Yes, I did

ſo. C. Then poſſibly it may erre in this? K. It may do ſo. C. Then what certainty have you that it does not erre in it? K. None at all, but upon this ſuppoſition, that this is a Fundamental. C. And this ſuppoſition you are uncertain of? K. Yes, I told you ſo before. C. And therefore you can have no certainty of that which depends upon this uncertainty, ſaving only a ſuppoſitive certainty, if it be a Fundamental truth; which is in plain Engliſh to ſay, you are certain it is true, if it be both true and neceſſary. Verily Sir, if you have no better Faith than this, you are no Catholique. K. Good words I pray! I am ſo, and God willing will be ſo. C. You mean in outward profeſſion and practiſe, but in belief you are not, no more than a Proteſtant is a Catholique. For every Proteſtant yeelds ſuch a kinde of aſſent to all the propoſals of the Church, for ſurely they believe them true, if they be Fundamental truths. And therefore you muſt either believe the Church Infallible in all her propoſals, be they foundations, or be they ſuperſtructions; or you muſt believe all Fundamental which ſhe propoſes, or elſe you are no Catholique. K. But I have been taught, that *ſeeing I believed the Church infallible in points neceſſary, in wiſdom I was to believe her in every thing.* C. That was a pretty plauſible inducement, to bring you hither; but now you are here, you muſt go farther, and believe her infallible in all things, or elſe you were as good go back again, which will be a great diſparagement to you, and draw upon you both the bitter and implacable hatred of our Part, and even, with your own, the imputation of raſhneſs and levity. You ſee, I hope by this time, that though a man did believe your Church infallible in Fundamentals, yet he hath no reaſon to do you the curteſie of believing all her Propoſals; nay, if he be ignorant what theſe Fundamentals are, he hath no certain ground to believe her, upon her Authority, in any thing. And whereas you ſay, it can be no imprudence, to erre with the Church; I ſay, it may be very great imprudence, if the queſtion be, Whether we ſhould erre with the preſent Church, or hold true with God Almighty.

58. *But we are, under pain of damnation, to believe and obey her in greater things, and therefore cannot in wiſdom ſuſpect her credit in matters of leſs moment.* Anſw. I have told you already, that this is falſly to ſuppoſe, that we grant that in ſome certain points, ſome certain Church is infallibly aſſiſted, and under pain of damnation to be obeyed: whereas all that we ſay is this, that in ſome place or other, ſome Church there ſhall be, which ſhall retain all neceſſary Truths. Yet if your ſuppoſition were true, I would not grant your Concluſion, but with this Exception, unleſs the matter were paſt ſuſpition, and apparently certain, that in theſe things I cannot believe God, nd believe the Church. For then I hope you will grant, that be the thing of never ſo little moment, were it, for inſtance, but that S. *Paul left his cloak at Troas*, yet I were not to gratifie the Church ſo far, as for her ſake to disbelieve what God himſelf hath revealed.

59 Whereas you ſay, *Since we are undoubtedly obliged to believe her in Fundamentals, and cannot know preciſely, what thoſe Fundamentals be, we cannot without hazard of our ſouls leave her in any Point*; I anſwer, Firſt, that this argument proceeds upon the ſame falſe ground with the former. And then, that I have told you formerly, that you feare where no fear is; And though we know not preciſely, juſt how much is Fundamental, yet we know, that the Scripture containes all Fundamentals, and more too; and therefore

that

that in believing that, we believe all Fundamentals and more too. And consequently, in departing from you, can be in no danger of departing from that which may prove a Fundamental Truth: For we are wel assured that certain Errors can never prove Fundamental Truths.

60. Whereas you adde, That *that visible Church which cannot erre in Fundamentals, propounds all her definitions without distinction to be believed under Anathema's*: Answ. Again you beg the question, supposing untruly, that there is any *that visible Church*. I mean any Visible Church of one Denomination, which cannot erre in Points Fundamental. Secondly, proposing definitions to be believed under Anathema's, is no good Argument, that the Propounders conceive themselves infallible; but only that they conceive the Doctrin they condemn is evidently damnable. A plain proof hereof is this, that particular Councils, nay, particular Men, have been very liberal of their Anathema's, which yet were never conceived infallible, either by others or themselves. If any man should now deny Christ to be the Saviour of the world, or deny the Resurrection, I should make no great scruple of Anathematizing his doctrin, and yet am very far from dreaming of infallibility.

61. And for the *Visible Churches holding it a Point necessary to Salvation, that we believe she cannot erre*, I know no such tenet; unless by the Church, you mean the *Roman* Church, which you have as much reason to do, as that petty King in *Africk* hath, to think himself King of all the world. And therefore your telling us, *If she speak true, what danger is it, not to believe her? and if false, that it is not dangerous to believe her*, is somewhat like your Pope's setting your Lawyers to dispute whether *Constantine's Donation* were valid or no; whereas the matter of fact was the far greater question, whether there were any such Donation, or rather when without question there was none such. That you may not seem to delude us in like maner, make it appear that the visible Church doth hold so as you pretend: and then whether it be true or false, we will consider afterwards. But for the present, with this invisible Tenet of the visible Church, we will trouble our selves no farther.

62. The effect of the next Argument is this, *I cannot without grievous sin disobey the Church, unless I know she commands those things which are not in her power to command: and how far this power extends, none can better inform me then the Church. Therefore I am to obey, so far as the Church requires my obedience*. I answer: First, that neither hath the Catholique Church, but only a corrupt part of it, declared her self, nor required our obedience, in the Points contested among us. This therefore is falsly, and vainly supposed here by you, being one of the greatest Questions amongst us. Then secondly, that God can better inform us, what are the limits of the Churches power, than the Church her self, that is, than the *Roman* Clergy, who being men subject to the same passions with other men, why they should be thought the best Judges in their owne cause, I do not well understand! But yet we oppose against them, no humane decisive Judges, not any Sect or Person, but only God and his Word. And therefore it is in vain to say, That *in following her, you shall be sooner excused, than in following any Sect or Man applying Scriptures against her Doctrin*: In as much as we never went about to arrogate to our selves that Infallibility or absolute Authority, which we take away from you. But if you would have spoken to the

purpose, you should have said, that in following her you should sooner have been excused, then in cleaving to the Scripture, and to God himself.

63. Whereas you say, *The fearful examples of innumerable persons, who forsaking the Church, upon pretence of her errours, have failed even in Fundamental Points, ought to deterr all Christians from opposing her in any one Doctrin or practise*; This is, just as if you should say, Divers men have fallen into Scylla, with going too far from Charybdis; be sure therefore ye keep close to Charybdis: Divers leaving Prodigality, have fallen into covetousness, therefore be you constant to Prodigality: Many have fallen from worshipping God perversly and foolishly, not to worship him at all; from worshipping many gods, to worship none; this therefore ought to deterr men from leaving Superstition or Idolatry, for fear of falling into Atheism and Impiety. This is your counsel and Sophistry: but God sayes clean contrary; *Take heed you swerve not, either to the right hand or to the left: you must not do evill that good may come thereon*; therefore neither, that you may avoid a greater evill, you must not be obstinate in a certain error, for fear of an uncertain. What if some, forsaking the Church of *Rome*, have forsaken Fundamental truths? Was this because they forsooke the Church of *Rome?* No sure, this is *non causa pro causa*: for else all that have forsaken that Church should have done so, which we say they have not. But because they went too far from her, the golden mean, the narrow way, is hard to be found, and hard to be kept; hard, but not impossible: hard, but yet you must not please your self out of it, though you erre on the right hand, though you offend on the milder part, for this is the only way that leads to life, and few there be that find it. It is true, if we said there were no danger in being of the *Roman* Church, and there were danger in leaving it, it were madness to perswade any man to leave it. But we protest and proclaim the contrary, and that we have very little hope of their Salvation, who either out of negligence in seeking the truth, or unwillingness to find it, live and die in the errors and impieties of that Church: and therefore cannot but conceive those fears to be most foolish, and ridiculous, which perswade men to be constant in one way to hell, lest haply, if they leave it, they should fall into another.

64. But, *Not only others, but even Protestants themselves, whose example ought most to move us, pretending to reform the Church, are come to affirm that she perished for many ages: which* D. Potter *cannot deny to be a Fundamental errour, against the Article of the Creed, I believe the Catholique Church, seeing he affirms,* Donatists *erred Fundamentally in confining it to Africa.* To this I answer, First, that the error of the *Donatists* was not, that they held it possible that some, or many, or most, parts of Christendome, might fall away from Christianity, and that the Church may lose much of her amplitude, and be contracted to a narrow compass in comparison of her former extent: which is proved not only possible, but certain, by irrefragable experience. For who knows not that Gentilism, and Mahumetism, mans wickedness deserving it, and Gods providence permitting it, have prevailed, to the utter extirpation of Christianity, upon far the greater part of the world? And S. *Austin* when he was out of the heat of Disputation, confesses the Militant Church to be *like the Moon*, sometimes increasing, and sometimes decreasing. This therefore was no errour in the

Donatists,

Donatists, that they held it possible, that the Church, from a large extent, might be contracted to a lesser: nor that they held it possible to be reduced to *Africa*, (For why not to *Africk* then, as well as within these few Ages, you pretend it was to *Europe?*) But their error was, that they held *de facto*, this was done when they had no just ground or reason to do so: and so, upon a vain pretence which they could not justifie, separated themselves from the communion of all other parts of the Church: and that they required it as a necessary condition to make a man a member of the Church, that he should be of their communion, and divide himself from all other Communions from which they were divided: which was a condition both unnecessary and unlawful to be required, and therefore the exacting of it was directly opposite to the Churches Catholicism; in the very same nature with their Errors who required Circumcision, and the keeping of the Law of *Moses*, as necessary to salvation. For whosoever requires harder or heavyer conditions of men, than God requires of them, he it is that is properly an Enemy of the Churches Universality, by hindering either Men or Countries from adjoyning themselves to it; which, were it not for these unnecessary and therefore unlawful conditions, in probability would have made them members of it. And seeing the present Church of *Rome* perswades men they were as good (for any hope of salvation they have) not be Christians, as not be *Romane* Catholiques; believe nothing at all, as not believe all which she imposes upon them; be absolutely out of the Churches Communion, as be out of her Communion, or be in any other, Whether she be not guilty of the same crime, with the *Donatists* and those Zelots of the Mosaical Law, I leave it to the judgement of those that understand reason! This is sufficient to shew the vanity of this Argument. But I adde moreover, that you neither have named those Protestants who held the Church to have perished for many Ages, who perhaps held not the destruction but the corruption of the Church; not that the true Church, but that the pure Church perished: or rather that the Church perished not from its life and existence, but from its purity and integrity, or perhaps from its splendor and visibility: Neither have you proved by any one reason, but only affirmed it, to be a Fundamental Error, to hold that the Church militant may possibly be driven out of the world, and abolished for a time from the face of the earth.

65. *But to accuse the Church of any Error in Faith, is to say, she lost all Faith: For this is the Doctrin of Catholique Divines, that one Errour in Faith destroyes Faith.* To which I answer, that to accuse the Church of some Error in Faith, is not to say, she lost all Faith: For this is not the Doctrin of all Catholique Divines; But that he which is an Heretique in one Article, may have true Faith of other Articles. And the contrary is only said and not shewed in *Charity Mistaken*.

66. *Ad* §. 21. D. *Potter* saies, *We may not depart from the Church absolutely, and in all things*: and from hence you conclude, *Therefore we may not depart from it, in any thing*. And this Argument you call a Demonstration. But, a Fallacy *à dicto simpliciter ad dictum secundum quid*, was not used heretofore to be called a Demonstration. D. *Potter* says not, that you may not depart from any opinion or any practice of the Church: for you tell us in this very place, that he sayes, even the Catholique may err: and every man may lawfully depart from Error. He only says, *You may not*

ceaſe to be of the Church, nor depart from thoſe things which make it ſo to be; and from hence you infer a neceſſity of forſaking it in nothing. Juſt as if you ſhould argue thus: You may not leave your friend or brother, therefore you may not leave the Vice of your friend, or the Errour of your brother. What he ſayes of the Catholique Church, p. 75. the ſame he extends preſently after, *to every true, though never ſo corrupted, part of it.* And why do you not conclude from hence, that no particular Church (according to his judgment) can fall into any Error, and call this a Demonſtration too? For, as he ſayes, p. 75. That *there can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the whole Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf*; So p. 76. he tels you, That *whoſoever forſakes any one true member of this body, forſakes the whole.* So that what he ſayes of the one, he ſayes of the other; and tels you, that neither Univerſal nor particular Church, ſo long as they continue ſo, may be forſaken; he means, *Abſolutely*, no more than Chriſt himſelf may be forſaken abſolutely: For the Church is the body of Chriſt, and whoſoever forſakes either the body, or his coherence to any one part of it, muſt forſake his ſubordination, and relation to the Head. Therefore whoſoever forſakes the Church, or any Chriſtian, muſt forſake Chriſt himſelf.

67. But then he tels you plainly in the ſame place, *That it may be lawful and neceſſary to depart from a Particular Church in ſome Doctrins and Practices:* And this he would have ſaid even of the Catholike Church, if there had been occaſion, but there was none. For there he was to declare and juſtifie our departure, not from the Catholike Church, but the *Roman*, which we maintain to be a particular Church. But in other places, you confeſs his Doctrin to be, that even the Catholique Church may erre in points not Fundamental; which you do not pretend that he ever imputed to Chriſt himſelf. And therefore you cannot with any candor interpret his words, as if he had ſaid, We may not forſake the Church in any thing, no more than Chriſt himſelf: but only thus, We may not ceaſe to be of the Church, nor forſake it abſolutely and totally, no more than Chriſt himſelf. And thus we ſee ſometimes, A mountain may travel, and the production may be a mouſe.

68. *Ad §.22.* But D. *Potter either contradicts himſelf, or elſe muſt grant the Church infallible; Becauſe, he ſaies, if we did not differ from the* Roman, *we could not agree with the Catholique: which ſaying ſuppoſes, the Catholique Church cannot erre.* Anſwer. This Argument, to give it the right name, is an obſcure and intricate Nothing. And to make it appear ſo, let us ſuppoſe, in contradiction to your ſuppoſition, either that the Catholique Church may erre, but doth not, but that the *Roman* actually doth: or, that the Catholique Church doth erre in ſome few things, but that the *Roman* erres in many more. And is it not apparent in both theſe caſes, (which yet both ſuppoſe the Churches Fallibility) a man may truly ſay, Unleſs I diſſent in ſome opinions from the *Roman* Church, I cannot agree with the Catholique? Either therefore you muſt retract your imputation laid upon D. *Potter*, or do that which you condemn in him, and be driven to ſay, that the ſame man may hold ſome errors with the Church of *Rome*, and at the ſame time with the Catholique Church not to hold but condemn them. For otherwiſe, in neither of theſe caſes is it poſſible for the ſame man, at the ſame time, to agree both with the *Roman* and the Catholique.

69. In all theſe Texts of Scripture, which are here alleaged in this laſt Section of this Chapter, or in any one of them, or in any other, Doth God ſay cleerly

clearly and plainly, *The Bishop of* Rome, *and that Society of Christians which adheres to him, shall be ever the infallible guide of Faith?* You will confess, I presume, he doth not; and will pretend, it was not necessary. Yet if the King should tell us, the Lord Keeper should judge such and such causes; but should either not tell us at all, or tell us but doubtfully, who should be Lord-Keeper, should we be any thing the nearer for him to an end of contentions? Nay rather, would not the dissentions about the Person who it is, increase contentions, rather than end them? Just so it would have been, if God had appointed a Church to be Judge of Controversies, and had not told us which was that Church. Seeing therefore God doth nothing in vain, and seeing it had been in vain, to appoint a Judge of Controversies, and not to tell us plainly who it is; and seeing lastly he hath not told us plainly, no not at all who it is; Is it not evident he hath appointed none? Obj. *But* (you will say perhaps) *if it be granted once, that some Church of one denomination, is the infallible Guide of Faith, it will be no difficult thing to prove, that yours is the Church, seeing no other Church pretends to be so.* Answ. Yes, the Primitive and the Apostolique Church pretends to be so. That assures us, that the *Spirit was promised, and given to them, to lead them into all saving truth*, that they might lead others. Obj. *But that Church is not now in the world, and how then can it pretend to be the Guide of Faith?* Answ. It is now in the world sufficiently to be our Guide; not by the Persons of those men that were Members of it, but by their Writings, which do plainly teach us, what truth they were led into, and so lead us into the same truth. Object. *But these writings, were the writings of some particular men, and not of the Church of those times: how then doth that Church guide us by these writings? Now these places shew that a Church is to be our Guide, therefore they cannot be so avoided.* Answ. If you regard the conception and production of these writings, they were the writings of particular men: But if you regard the Reception and Approbation of them, they may be well called the writings of the Church, as having the attestation of the Church, to have been written by those that were inspired and directed by God. As a Statute, though penned by some one man, yet being ratified by the Parliament, is called the Act, not of that man, but of the Parliament. Object. But the *words seem clearly enough to prove, that the Church, the Present Church of every Age, is Universally Infallible.* Ans. For my part, I know I am as willing and desirous, that the Bishop or Church of *Rome* should be infallible, (provided I might know it) as they are to be so esteemed. But he that would not be deceived must take heed, that he take not his desire that a thing should be so, for a reason that it is so. For, if you look upon Scripture, through such spectacles as these, they will appear to you, of what colour pleases your fancies best: and will seem to say, not what they do say, but what you would have them. As some say, the *Manna*, wherewith the *Israelites* were fed in the Wilderness, had in every mans mouth, that very taste which was most agreeable to his palate. For my part I profess, I have considered them a thousand times, and have looked upon them (as they say) on both sides, and yet to me they seem to say no such matter.

70. Not the first. For the *Church may err, and yet the gates of hell not prevail against her.* It may err, and yet continue still a true Church, and bring forth Children unto God, and send souls to Heaven. And therefore

this

this can do you no ſervice, without the plain begging of the point in Queſtion, *viz.* That every error is one of the gates of Hell. Which we abſolutely deny, and therefore, you are not to ſuppoſe, but to prove it. Neither is our denial without reaſon. For ſeeing you do, and muſt grant, that a particular Church, may hold ſome error, and yet be ſtill a true Member of the Church: Why may not the Univerſal Church hold the ſame error, and yet remain the true Univerſal?

71. Not the Second or Third. For, *the Spirit of Truth, may be with a Man, or a Church for ever, and teach him all Truth:* And yet he may fall into ſome error, if this *all*, be not *ſimply all*, but all of ſome kind: which you confeſs to be ſo unqueſtioned and certain, that you are offended with D. *Potter*, for offering to prove it. Secondly, he may fall into ſome error, even contrary to the truth which is taught him, if it be taught him *only ſufficiently, and not irreſiſtibly*, ſo that he may learn it if he will, not ſo that he muſt and ſhall whether he will or no. Now, who can aſcertain me, that the Spirit's teaching is not of this nature; or, how can you poſſibly reconcile it, with your Doctrin of Freewill in believing, if it be not of this nature? Beſides, the word in the Original is ὁδηγήσει, which ſignifies, to be a guide and directer only, not to compel or neceſſitate. Who knows not, that a Guide may ſet you in the right way, and you may either negligently miſtake, or willingly leave it? And to what purpoſe doth God complain ſo often, and ſo earneſtly of ſome, that *had eyes to ſee and would not ſee, that ſtopped their ears, and cloſed their eyes, leſt they ſhould hear and ſee?* Of others *that would not underſtand, leſt they ſhould do good: That the light ſhined, and the darkneſs comprehended it not: That he came unto his own, and his own received him not: That light came into the world, and men loved darkneſs more than light? To what purpoſe ſhould he wonder, ſo few believed his report, and that to ſo few his Arm was revealed: And that when he comes, he ſhould no find no Faith upon Earth, if his outward teaching were not of this nature*, that it might be followed, and might be reſiſted. And if it be, then God may teach, and the Church not learn: God may lead, and the Church be refractory and not follow. And indeed, who can doubt, that hath not his eyes vailed with prejudice, that God hath taught the Church of *Rome*, plain enough in the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, that *all things in the Church are to be done for edification*; and that in any publique Prayers, or Thanks-givings, or Hymns, or Leſſons of Inſtruction, to *uſe a language*, which the aſſiſtants *generally underſtand not*, is not for edification? Though the Church of *Rome* will not learn this, for fear of confeſſing an error, and ſo overthrowing her Authority; yet the time will come, when it ſhall appear, that not only by Scripture, they were taught this ſufficiently, and commanded to believe it, but by reaſon and common ſenſe. And ſo for the Communion in both kinds, who can deny but they are taught it by our Saviour, *Joh.6.* in theſe words, according to moſt of your own expoſitions, *Unleſs you eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you.* (If our Saviour ſpeak there, of the Sacrament, as to them he doth, becauſe they conceive he doth ſo.) For though they may pretend, that receiving in one kind, they receive the blood together with the body, yet they can with no face pretend that they drink it: And ſo obey not our Saviour's injunction according to the letter, which yet they *profeſs, is literally alwayes to be obeyed,*

unleſs

unleſs ſome impiety, or ſome abſurdity force us to the contrary: and they are not yet arrived to that impudence, to pretend, that either there is impiety or abſurdity in receiving the Communion in both kinds. This therefore, they, if not others, are plainly taught by our Saviour in this place: But by S. *Paul* all without exception, when he ſays; *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread, and drink of this Chalice.* This (*a Man*) that is to examine himſelf, is *every man*, that can do it: as is confeſſed on all hands. And therefore it is all one, as if he had ſaid, *Let every man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup.* They which acknowledge S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and S. *John*'s Goſpel, to be the Word of God, one would think ſhould not deny, but that they are taught theſe two Doctrines plain enough. Yet we ſee they neither do, nor will learn them. I conclude therefore, that the Spirit may very well teach the Church, and yet the Church fall into and continue in Error, by not regarding what ſhe is taught by the Spirit.

72. But all this I have ſpoken upon a ſuppoſition only, and ſhewed unto you, that though theſe Promiſes had been made unto the preſent Church of every Age (I might have ſaid though they had been to the Church of *Rome* by name) yet no certainty of her Univerſal Infallibility could be built upon them. But the plain truth is, that theſe Promiſes are vainly arrogated by you, and were never made to you, but to the Apoſtles only. I pray deal ingenuouſly, and tell me, Who were they of whom our Saviour ſays, *Theſe things have I ſpoken unto you being preſent with you*, c. 14. 25. *But the Comforter ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have told you*, v. 26? Who are they to whom he ſayes, *I go away and come again unto you*; And *I have told you before it come to paſs*, v. 28, 29. *You have been with me from the beginning*, c. 15. v. 27? And again; *Theſe things I have told you, that when the time ſhall come, you may remember that I told you of them: and theſe things I ſaid not to you at the beginning, becauſe I was with you*, c. 16. v. 4. And, *Becauſe I ſaid theſe things unto you, ſorrow hath filled your hearts*, v. 6 Laſtly, Who are they of whom he ſaith, v. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now*? Do not all theſe circumſtances appropriate this whole diſcourſe of our Saviour to his Diſciples, that were then with him, and, conſequently, reſtrain the Promiſes of the Spirit of Truth, which was *to lead them into all truth*, to their Perſons only? And ſeeing it is ſo, is it not an impertinent arrogance and preſumption, for you to lay claim unto them, in the behalf of your Church? Had Chriſt been preſent with your Church? Did the Comforter bring theſe things to the Remembrance of your Church, which Chriſt had before taught, and ſhe had forgotten? Was Chriſt then departing from your Church? And did he tell of his departure before it came to paſs? Was your Church with him from the beginning? Was your Church filled with ſorrow, upon the mentioning of Chriſt's departure? Or laſtly, Did he, or could he have ſaid to your Church, which then was not extant, *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now?* as he ſpeaks in the 13. v. immediately before the words by you quoted. And then goes on, *Howbeit when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth.* Is it not the ſame *You* he ſpeaks to in the 13. v. and that he ſpeaks to in the 14? And is it not apparent to any one that hath but half an eye, that in the 13. he ſpeaks only to them that then

were

were with him? Besides, in the very Text by you alledged, there are things promised, which your Church cannot with any modesty pretend to. For there it is said, *The Spirit of Truth* not only *will guide you into all Truth*, but also *will shew you things to come*. Now your Church (for ought I could ever understand) doth not so much as pretend to the spirit of Prophecy, and knowledge of future events: And therefore hath as little cause to pretend to the former promise of being *led by the Spirit into all Truth*. And this is the Reason, why both You in this place, and genetally, your Writers of Controversies, when they entreat of this Argument, cite this Text perpetually by halfs; there being in the latter part of it, a clear, and convincing Demonstration, that you have nothing to do with the former. Unless you will say, which is most ridiculous, that when our Saviour said, *He will teach you*, &c. and *he will shew you*, &c. he meant one *You* in the former clause, and another *You* in the latter.

73. Object. But this *is to confine God's Spirit to the Apostles only, or to the Disciples, that then were present with him: which is directly contrary to many places of Scripture*. Answ. I confess, that to confine the Spirit of God to those that were then present with Christ, is against Scripture. But, I hope, it is easie to conceive a difference, between confining the *Spirit of God* to them, and confining *the promises made in this place* to them. God may do many things which he doth not promise at all; much more, which he doth not promise in such or such a place.

74. Object. But *it is promised in the* 14. *Chap. that this Spirit shall abide with them for ever: Now they in their persons were not to abide for ever, and therefore the Spirit could not abide with them, in their Persons for ever, seeing the coexistence of two things, supposes of necessity, the existence of either. Therefore the Promise was not made to them only in their Persons, but by them to the Church, which was to abide for ever*. Answ. Your Conclusion is, *not to them only*, but your Reason concludes, either nothing at all, or that this Promise of abiding with them for ever, was not made to their Persons at all; or, if it were, that it was not performed, Or, if you will not say (as I hope you will not) that it was not performed, nor that it was not made to their Persons at all; then must you grant, that the word *for ever*, is here used in a sense restrained, and accommodated to the subject here entreated of; and that it signifies, *not eternally*, without end of time, *but perpetually*, without interruption, for the time of their lives. So that the force, and sense of the words is, that they should never want the Spirit's assistance, in the performance of their function: And that the Spirit would not (as Christ was to do) stay with them for a time, and afterwards leave them, but would abide with them, if they kept their station, unto the very end of their lives, which is mans *for ever*. Neither is this use of the word, *for ever*, any thing strange, either in our ordinary speech, wherein we use to say, This is mine for ever, This shall be yours for ever, without ever dreaming of the Eternity, either of the Thing or Persons. And then in Scripture, it not only will bear, but requires, this sense very frequently, as *Exod.* 21. 6. *Deut.* 15. 17. *His master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him for ever. Psal.* 52. 9. *I will praise thee for ever, Psal.* 61. 4. *I will abide in thy Tabernacle for ever, Psal.* 119. 111. *Thy Testimonies have I taken as mine heritage for ever*. And lastly, in the Ep.

to

to *Philemon, He therefore departed from thee for a time, that thou ſhouldſt receive him for ever.*

75. And thus, I preſume, I have ſhewed ſufficiently, that this *for ever*, hinders not, but that the promiſe may be appropriated to the Apoſtles, as by many other circumſtances I have evinced it muſt be. But what now, if the place produced by you, as a main pillar of your Churches Infallibility, prove upon trial, an engine to batter and overthrow it, at leaſt, (which is all one to my purpoſe) to take away all poſſibility of our aſſurance of it? This will ſeem ſtrange news to you at firſt hearing, and not far from a prodigy. And I confeſs, as you here in this place, and generally all your Writers of Controverſie, by whom this Text is urged, order the matter, it is very much diſabled, to do any ſervice againſt you in this queſtion. For with a bold ſacriledge, and horrible impiety, ſomewhat like *Procruſtes* his cruelty, you perpetually cut off the head and foot, the beginning and end of it; and preſenting to your Confidents, (who uſually read no more of the Bible, than is alledged by you) only theſe words, *I will ask my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth*, conceal in the mean time, the words before, and the words after; that ſo, the promiſe of God's Spirit, may ſeem to be abſolute, whereas it is indeed moſt clearly and expreſly conditional: being both in the words before, reſtrained to thoſe only, that *love GOD, and keep his Commandments*: and in the words after, flatly denied to all, whom the Scriptures ſtile by the name of *the World*, that is, as the very Antitheſis gives us plainly to underſtand, *to all wicked and wordly men.* Behold the place entire, as it is ſet down in your own Bible: *If ye love me keep my Commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of the Truth, whom the world cannot receive.* Now from the place thus reſtored and vindicated from your mutilation, thus I argue againſt your pretence. We can have no certainty of the Infallibility of your Church, but upon this ſuppoſition, that your Popes are infallible in confirming the Decrees of General Councels: we can have no certainty hereof, but upon this ſuppoſition, that the Spirit of Truth is promiſed to them for their direction in this work: And of this again we can have no certainty, but upon ſuppoſal, that they perform the condition, whereunto the promiſe of the Spirit of Truth is expreſly limited, *viz. That they love God and keep his Commandments:* And of this finally, not knowing the Popes heart, we can have no certainty at all; therefore from the firſt to the laſt, we can have no certainty at all of your Churches Infallibility. This is my firſt Argument. Another follows, which will charge you as home as the former. If many of the *Roman* See, were ſuch men as could not receive the Spirit of Truth, even men of the World, that is, Wordly, Wicked, Carnal, Diabolical men; then the Spirit of Truth is not here promiſed, but flatly denied them: and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees of Councels, which theſe Popes confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which is guided by theſe Decrees: But many of the *Roman* See, even by the confeſſion of the moſt zealous Defenders of it, were ſuch men: Therefore the Spirit of Truth is not here promiſed, but denied them; and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees, which they confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which guides her ſelf by theſe Decrees.

76. You

76. You may take as much time as you think fit, to anſwer theſe Arguments. In the mean while I proceed to the conſideration of the next Text alledged for this purpoſe by you; out of S. *Paul*, 1 Ep. to *Timothy*, where he ſaith, as you ſay, *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* But the truth is, you are ſomewhat too bold with S. *Paul*; For he ſays not in formal terms, what you make him ſay, *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, neither is it certain that he means ſo: for it is neither impoſſible nor improbable, that theſe words, *the pillar and ground of truth*, may have reference not to the Church, but to *Timothy*, the ſenſe of the place *that thou maiſt know how to behave thy ſelf, as a Pillar and Ground of the Truth, in the Church of God, which is houſe of the living God*, which expoſition offers no violence at all to the words, but only ſuppoſes an *Ellipſis* of the Particle ὡς, in the Greek very ordinary. Neither wants it ſome likelihood, that S. *Paul* comparing the Church to a houſe, ſhould here exhort *Timothy*, to carry himſelf, as a Pillar in that houſe ſhould do, according as he had given other principal men in the Church, the name of Pillars; rather then having called the Church a *Houſe*, to call it preſently a *Pillar*; which may ſeem ſomewhat heterogeneous. Yet if you will needs have S. *Paul* refer this not to *Timothy*, but to the Church, I will not contend about it any farther, then to ſay, Poſſibly it may be otherwiſe. But then ſecondly, I am to put you in mind, that the Church which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, was that in which *Timothy* converſed, and that was a Particular Church, and not the *Roman*; and ſuch you will not have to be Univerſally Infallible.

77. Thirdly, if we grant you out of courteſie (for nothing can enforce us to it) that he both ſpeaks of the Univerſal Church, and ſays this of it; then I am to remember you, that many Attributes in Scripture, are not notes of performance, but of duty, and teach us not what the Thing or Perſon is of neceſſity, but what it ſhould be. *Ye are the Salt of the Earth*, ſaid our Saviour to his Diſciples: not that this quality was inſeparable from their Perſons, but becauſe it was their Office to be ſo. For, if they muſt have been ſo of neceſſity, and could not have been otherwiſe, in vain had he put in them fear of that which follows, *If the Salt hath loſt his ſavour, wherewith ſhall it be ſalted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be caſt forth, and to be trodden under foot.* So the Church may be by duty, the pillar and ground, that is, the Teacher of Truth, of all Truth, not only neceſſary, but profitable to Salvation; and yet ſhe may neglect and violate this duty, and be in fact the teacher of ſome Error.

78. Fourthly and laſtly, if we deal moſt liberally with you, and grant that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the Catholike Church, calls it the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, and that not only becauſe it ſhould, but becauſe it always ſhall and will be ſo, yet after all this, you have done nothing; your bridge is too ſhort to bring you to the bank where you would be, unleſs you can ſhew, that by Truth here is certainly meant, not only *all neceſſary* to ſalvation, but all that is profitable, abſolutely and *ſimply All*. For that the true Church always ſhall be the maintainer and teacher of all neceſſary Truth, you know we grant, and muſt grant; for it is of the eſſence of the Church to be ſo, and any company of men were no more a Church without it, than any thing can be a man, and not be reaſonable. Put as a man may be ſtill a man, though he want a hand or an eye, which yet are profitable parts; ſo the Church may be ſtill a Church, though it be defective

fective in some profitable truth. And as a man may be a man that hath some biles and botches on his body; so the Church may be the Church, though it have many corruptions both in doctrine and practice.

79. And thus you see we are at liberty from the former places; having shewed that the sense of them, either must or may be such as will do your Cause no service. But the last you suppose will be a Gordian knot, and tie us fast enough: The words are, *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, &c. to the consummation of Saints, to the work of the Ministery, &c. Until we all meet into the Unity of faith, &c. That we be not hereafter Children, wavering and carryed up and down with every wind of Doctrin.* Out of which words this is the only Argument which you collect, or I can collect for you.

There is no means to conserve Unity of Faith, against every wind of Doctrin, unless it be a Church universally infallible.

But it is impious to say, There is no means to conserve Unity of Faith against every wind of Doctrin:

Therefore there must be a Church Universally Infallible.

Whereunto I answer, that your Major is so far from being confirmed, that it is plainly confuted by the place alleadged. For that tels us of another means for this purpose, to wit, the *Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Pastors, and Doctors*, which Christ gave upon his Ascension, and that their *consummating the Saints, doing the work of the Ministery*, and *edifying the body of Christ*, was the means to bring those (which are there spoken of, be they who they will) to *the Unity of Faith, and to perfection in Christ*, that they might not be *wavering, and carryed about with every wind of false Doctrin.* Now the Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Pastors, and Doctors, are not the present Church; therefore the Church is not the only means for this end, nor that which is here spoken of.

80. Peradventure by *he gave*, you conceive, is to be understood, *he promised that he would give unto the worlds end.* But what reason have you for this conceit? Can yon shew that the word ἔδωκε, hath this signification in other places, and that it must have it in this place? Or, will not this interpretation drive you presently to this blasphemous absurdity, that God hath not performed his promise? Unless you will say, which for shame I think you will not, that you have now, and in all Ages since Christ have had Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists: for as for Pastors, and Doctors alone, they will not serve the turn. For if God promised to give all these, then you must say, He hath given all, or else that he hath broke his promise. Neither may you pretend, that the *Pastors and Doctors were the same with the Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and therefore having Pastors and Doctors, you have all.* For it is apparent, that by these names, are denoted several Orders of men, clearly distinguished and diversified by the Original Text; but much more plainly by your own Translations, for so you read it, *some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors*: and yet more plainly in the parallel place, 1 *Cor.* 12. to which we are referred by your Vulgar Translation, *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*; therefore this subterfuge is stopped against you. Object. But *how can they, which died in the first Age, keep us in Unity, and guard us from Error, that live now, perhaps in the last? This seems to be all one, as if a man should say, that* Alexander, *or* Julius Cæsar, *should quiet a mutiny in the King of* Spain's *Army.* Answ. I

hope you will grant, that *Hippocrates*, and *Galen*, and *Euclid*, and *Ariſtotle*, and *Saluſt*, and *Caſar*, and *Livie*, were dead many Ages ſince; and yet that we are now preſerved from error by them, in a great part of Phyſick, of Geometry, of Logick, of the *Roman* Story. But what if theſe men had writ by Divine Inſpiration, and writ compleat bodies of the Sciences they profeſſed, and writ them plainly and perſpicuouſly? You would then have granted, I believe, that their works had been ſufficient to keep us from error, and from diſſention in theſe matters. And why then ſhould it be incongruous to ſay, that the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion, by their writings, which ſome of them writ, but all approved, are even now ſufficient means, to conſerve us in Unity of Faith, and guard us from error? Eſpecially, ſeeing theſe writings are, by the confeſſion of all parts, true and divine, and, as we pretend and are ready to prove, contain a plain and perfect Rule of Faith; and as the * Chiefeſt of you acknowledge, *contain immediately, all the Principal and fundamental Points of Chriſtianity*, referring us to the Church and Tradition only for ſome minute particularities. But tell me I pray, the Biſhops that compoſed the Decrees of the Councel of *Trent* and the Pope that confirmed them, are they means to conſerve you in Unity, and keep you from Error, or are they not? Peradventure you will ſay, *Their Decrees are, but not their Perſons*: but you will not deny I hope, that you owe your Unity, and freedome from Error, to the Perſons that made theſe Decrees: neither will they deny, that the writings which they have left behind them, are ſufficient for this purpoſe. And why may not then the Apoſtles writings be as fit for ſuch a purpoſe, as the Decrees of your Doctors? Surely, their intent in writing was to conſerve us in Unity of Faith, and to keep us from errour, and we are ſure God ſpake in them: but your Doctors from whence they are, we are not ſo certain. Was the Holy Ghoſt then unwilling, or unable to direct them ſo, that their writings ſhould be fit and ſufficient to attain that end they aimed at in writing? For if he were both able and willing to do ſo, then certainly he did do ſo. And then their writings may be very ſufficient means, if we would uſe them as we ſhould do, to preſerve us in Unity, in all neceſſary points of Faith, and to guard us from all pernitious Error.

* *Perron.*

81. If yet you be not ſatisfied, but will ſtill pretend, that *all theſe words by you cited, ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is Univerſally Infallible, without which, Unity of Faith could not be conſerved againſt every wind of Doctrin*: I anſwer, That to you which will not underſtand, that there can be any means to conſerve the Unity of Faith, but only that which conſerves your Authority over the Faithful, it is no marvel that theſe words ſeem to prove, that the Church, nay that your Church is univerſally infallible. But we that have no ſuch end, no ſuch deſires, but are willing to leave all men to their liberty, provided they will not improve it to a Tyranny over others, we find it no difficulty to diſcern between *dedit* and *promiſit*, *he gave at his Aſcenſion*, and *he promiſed to the worlds end*. Beſides, though you whom it concernes, may haply flatter your ſelves, that you have not only Paſtors, and Doctors, but Prophets, and Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, and thoſe diſtinct from the former ſtill in your Church; yet we that are diſintereſſed perſons, cannot but ſmile at theſe ſtrange imaginations. Laſtly, though you are apt to think your ſelves ſuch neceſſary inſtruments for all

good

good purposes, and that nothing can be well done unless you do it; that no unity or constancy in Religion can be maintained, but inevitably Christendom must fall to ruin, and confusion, unless you support it: yet we that are indifferent, and impartial, and well content, that God should give us his own favours, by means of his own appointment, not of our chooling, can easily collect out of these very words, that not the Infallibility of your, or of any Church, but the *Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, &c. which Christ gave upon his Ascension*, were designed by him, for the compassing all these excellent purposes, by their preaching while they lived, and by their writings for ever. And if they faile hereof, the Reason is not any insufficiency or invalidity in the means, but the voluntary perverseness of the subjects they have to deal with: who, if they would be themselves, and be content that others should be, in the choice of their Religion, the servants of God and not of men; if they would allow, that the way to heaven is no narrower now, then Christ left it, his yoak no heavier then he made it; that the belief of no more difficulties, is required now to Salvation, than was in the Primitive Church; that no error is in it self destructive, and exclusive from Salvation now, which was not then; if, instead of being zealous Papists, earnest Calvinists, rigid Lutherans, they would become themselves, and be content that others should be plain and honest Christians; if all men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themselves from prejudice and passion, would sincerely endeavour to finde the true sense of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do so; nor denying their Communion to any that do so, would so order their publique service of God, that all which do so may without scruple, or hypocrisie, or protestation against any part of it, joyn with them in it: who doth not see that seeing (as we suppose here, and shall prove hereafter) all necessary truths, are plainly and evidently set down in Scripture, there would of necessity be among all men, in all things necessary, Unity of Opinion? And, notwithstanding any other differences that are or could be, Unity of Communion, and Charity, and mutual toleration? By which means, all Schism and Heresie would be banished the world, and those wretched contentions which now rend and tear in pieces, not the coat, but the members and bowels of Christ, which mutual pride and Tyrannie, and cursing, and killing, and damning, would fain make immortal, should speedily receive a most blessed catastrophe. But of this hereafter, when we shall come to the Question of Schism, wherein I perswade my self, that I shall plainly shew, that the most vehement accusers, are the greatest offenders, and that they are indeed at this time, the greatest Schismatiques, who make the way to heaven narrower, the yoak of Christ heavier, the differences of Faith greater, the conditions of Ecclesiasticall Communion harder, and stricter, then they were made at the beginning by Christ and his Apostles: they who talk of Unity, but ayme at Tyrannie, and will have peace with none, but with their slaves and vassals. In the mean while, though I have shewed how Unity of Faith, and Unity of Charity too, may be preserved without your Churches Infallibility, yet seeing you modestly conclude from hence, not that your Church is, but only *seems to be* universally infallible, meaning to your self, of which you are a better Judge than I: Therefore I willingly grant your Conclusion, and proceed.

83. Whereas you say, That D. *Potter limits those promises and privileges to Fundamental points*; The truth is, with some of them he meddles not at all, neither doth his adversary give him occasion: Not with those out of the Epistle to *Timothy*, and to the *Ephesians*. To the rest he gives other answer besides this.

83. But *the words of Scripture by you alleadged are Universal, and mention no such restraint to Fundamentals*, as D. *Potter* applies to them: I answer, That, of the five Texts which you alleadge, four are indefinite, and only one universal, and that you confess is to be restrained, and are offended with D. *Potter* for going about to prove it. And *Whereas you say, they mention no restraint*, intimating that therefore they are not to be restrained, I tell you, This is no good consequence; for it may appear out of the matter and circumstances, that they are to be understood in a restrained sense, notwithstanding no restraint be mentioned. That place quoted by S. *Paul*, and applyed by him to our Saviour, *He hath put all things under his feet*, mentions no exception; yet S. *Paul* tels us, not only that it is true or certain, but *it is manifest, that He is excepted which did put all things under him*.

84. But *your interpretation is better than D.* Potters, *because it is literal*. I answer, His is Literal as well as yours: and you are mistaken if you think a restrained sense may not be a literal sense; for to *Restrained*, *Literal is not* opposed, but *unlimited* or absolute; and to *Literal*, is not oppos'd *Restrained*, but *Figurative*.

85. Whereas you say, D. *Potters Bretheren, rejecting his limitation, restrain the mentioned Texts to the Apostles*, implying hereby a contrariety between them and him: I answer, So doth D. *Potter* restrain all of them which he speaks of, in the pages by you quoted, to the Apostles, in the direct and primary sense of the words: Though he tels you there, the words in a more restrained sense are true, being understood of the Church Universal.

86. As for your pretence, That *to find the meaning of those places, you confer divers Texts, you consult Originals, you examine Translations, and use all the means by Protestants appointed*, I have told you before, that all this is vain and hypocritical, if (as your manner and your doctrin is) you give not your selves liberty of judgment in the use of these means; if you make not your selves Judges of, but only Advocates for the Doctrin of your Church, refusing to see what these means shew you, if it any way make against the Doctrin of your Church, though it be as clear as the light at noon. Remove Prejudice, eaven the Ballance, and hold it eaven, make it indifferent to you which way you go to heaven so you go the true, which Religion be true so you be of it, then use the means, and pray for Gods assistance, and as sure as God is true, you shall be lead into all necessary Truth.

87. Whereas you say, *you neither do, nor have any possible means to agree, as long as you are left to your selves*: The first is very true, That while you differ, you do not agree. But for the second, That you have no possible means of agreement, as long as you are left to your selves *i. e.* to your own reasons and judgment, this sure is very false, neither do you offer any proof of it, unless you intended this, that you *do not* agree, for a proof that you *cannot*; which sure is no good consequence, not halfe so good as this which I oppose against it: D. *Potter* and I, by the use of these means by you mentioned, do agree concerning the sense of these places, therefore there is a possible means of agreement; and therefore you also, if you would

use

uſe the ſame means, with the ſame minds, might agree ſo far as it is neceſſary, and it is not neceſſary that you ſhould agree farther. Or if there be no poſſible means to agree about the ſenſe of theſe Texts, whilſt we are left to our ſelves, then ſure it is impoſſible that we ſhould agree in your ſenſe of them, which was, That the Church is univerſally infallible. For if it were poſſible for us to agree in this ſenſe of them, then it were poſſible for us to agree. And why then ſaid you of the ſelf ſame Texts but in the page next before, *Theſe words ſeem clearly enough to prove that the Church is Univerſally infallible.* A ſtrange forgetfulneſs, that the ſame man, almoſt in the ſame breath, ſhould ſay of t e ſame words, They ſeem cleerly enough to prove ſuch a Concluſion true, and yet that three indifferent men, all preſum'd to be lovers of Truth, and induſtrious ſearchers of it, ſhould have no poſſible means, while they follow their own reaſon to agree in the Truth of this Concluſion!

88. Whereas you ſay, that, *It were great impiety to imagine that God, the lover of Souls, hath left no certain infallible means to decide both this and all other differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion:* I deſire you to take heed, you commit not an impiety in making more impieties than Gods Commandements make. Certainly, God is no way oblig'd either by his Promiſe or his Love to give us all things, that we may imagine would be convenient for us, as formerly I have proved at large. It is ſufficient that he denyes us nothing neceſſary to Salvation. *Deus non deficit in neceſſariis, nec redundat in ſuperfluis:* So D. *Stapleton.* But that the ending of all Controverſies, or having a certain means of ending them, is neceſſary to Salvation, that you have often ſaid and ſuppos'd, but never proved, though it be the main pillar of your whole diſcourſe. So little care you take how ſlight your Foundations are, ſo your Building make a fair ſhew. And as little care, how you commit thoſe faults your ſelf, which you condemn in others. For you here charge them with great impiety, who imagine that, *God the lover of Souls, hath left no infallible means to determine all differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion:* And yet afterwards being demanded by D. *Potter, Why the Queſtions between the Jeſuits and Dominicans remain undetermined?* You return him this croſs Interrogatory, *Who hath aſſured you that the Point wherein theſe learned men differ, is a revealed Truth, or capable of definition; or is not rather by plain Scripture indeterminable, or by any Rule of Faith?* So then when you ſay, *It were great impiety to imagine that God hath not left infallible means to decide all differences;* I may anſwer, It ſeems you do not believe your ſelf. For in this Controverſie which is of as high conſequence as any can be, you ſeem to be doubtful whether there be any means to determine it. On the other ſide, when you ask D. *Potter, Who aſſured him that there is any means to determine this Controverſie?* I anſwer for him, that you have; in calling it *a great impiety to imagine that there is not ſome infallible means to decide this and all other differences ariſing about the Interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion.* For what trick you can deviſe to ſhew that this difference between the Dominicans and Jeſuits, which includes a difference about the ſenſe of many texts of Scripture and many other matters of moment, was not included under *this and all other differences,* I cannot imagine. Yet if you can find out any, thus much at leaſt we ſhall gain by it, *that general ſpeeches are not always to be underſtood generally, but ſometimes with exceptions and limitations.*

89. But if there be any infallible means to decide all differences, I beſeech you name them. *You ſay, it is to conſult and hear Gods Viſible Church with ſubmiſsive acknowledgment of her Infallibility.* But ſuppoſe the difference be (as here it is) *whether your Church be infallible,* what ſhall decide that? If you would ſay (as you ſhould do) Scripture and Reaſon, then you foreſee that you ſhould be forced to grant, that theſe are fit means to decide this Controverſie, and therefore may be as fit to decide others. Therefore to avoid this, you run into a moſt ridiculous abſurdity, and tell us that this difference alſo, Whether the Church be infallible, as well as others, muſt be agreed by *a ſubmiſsive acknowledgment of the Churches Infallibility.* As if you ſhould have ſaid, My Bretheren, I perceive there is a great Contention amongſt you, whether the *Roman* Church be infallible? If you will follow my advice, I will ſhew you a ready means to end it; you muſt firſt agree that the *Roman* Church is infallible, and then your contention whether the *Roman* Church be infallible, will quickly be at an end. Verily, a moſt excellent advice, and moſt compendious way of ending all Controverſies, even without troubling the Church to determine them! For why may not you ſay in all other differences, as you have done in this? Agree that the Pope is ſupream head of the Church: That the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, is turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt: That the Communion is to be given to Lay-men but in one kind: That Pictures may be worſhipped: That Saints are to be invocated: and ſo in the reſt: and then your differences about the Popes Supremacy, Tranſubſtantiation, and all the reſt, will ſpeedily be ended. If you ſay, the advice is good in this, but not in other caſes, I muſt requeſt you, not to expect alwaies, to be believed upon your word, but to ſhew us ſome reaſon, why any one thing, namely the Churches Infallibility, is fit to prove it ſelf; and any other thing, by name the Popes Supremacy, or Tranſubſtantiation, is not as fit? Or if for ſhame you will at length confeſs, that the Churches infallibility is not fit to decide this difference, Whether the Church be infallible, then you muſt confeſs it is not fit to decide all: Unleſs you will ſay, it may be fit to decide all, and yet not fit to decide this, or pretend that this is not comprehended under all. Beſides, if you grant that your Churches Infallibility cannot poſſibly be well grounded upon, or decided by it ſelf, then having profeſſed before, that *there is no poſsible means beſides this, for us to agree hereupon,* I hope you will give me leave to conclude, that it is impoſſible upon good ground for us to agree that the *Roman* Church is infallible. For certainly, light it ſelf is not more clear than the evidence of this Syllogiſm;

If there be no other means to make men agree upon your Churches Infallibility, but only this, and this be no means; then it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is infallible:

But there is (as you have granted) no other poſſible means to make men agree hereupon, but only a ſubmiſſive ackdowledgment of her Infallibility, And this is apparently no means;

Therefore it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is infallible.

90. Laſtly, to the place of S. *Auſtin, wherein we are advis'd to follow the way of Catholique Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelf by the Apoſtles hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity*; I anſwer,

That

That the way which S. *Auſtin* ſpake of, and the way which you commend, being divers wayes, and in many things clean contrary, we cannot poſſibly follow them both; and therefore for you to apply the ſame words to them is a vain equivocation. Shew us any way, and do not ſay, but prove it *to have come from Chriſt and his Apoſtles down to us*, and we are ready to follow it. Neither do we expect demonſtration hereof, but ſuch reaſons as may make this more probable than the contrary. But if you bring in things into your now Catholique Diſcipline, which Chriſtians in S. *Auſtins* time held abominable, (as the picturing of God,) and which you muſt, and ſome of you do confeſs to have come into the Church ſeven hundred yeers after Chriſt: if you will bring in things, as you have done the halfe Communion, with a *non obſtante, notwithſtanding Chriſts Inſtitution, and the practice of the Primitive Church, were to the contrary:* If you will do ſuch things as theſe, and yet would have us believe, that your whole Religion came from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, this we conceive a requeſt too unreaſonable for modeſt men to make, or for wiſe men to grant.

CHAP. IV.

To ſay, that the Creed contains all Points neceſſarily to be believed, is neither pertinent *to the Queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelf* true.

I SAY, neither *pertinent*, nor *true*. Not *pertinent*: Becauſe our Queſtion is not, What Points are neceſſary to be explicitely believed; but what Points may be lawfully *disbelieved*, or rejected after ſufficient Propoſition that they are divine Truths. You ſay, the Creed contains all Points neceſſary to be believed: Be it ſo But doth it likewiſe contain all Points not to be disbelieved? Certainly it doth not. For how many Truths are there in holy Scripture not contained in the Creed, which we are not obliged diſtinctly, and particularly to know and believe, but are bound under pain of damnation not to reject, as ſoon as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture? And we having already ſhewed, that whatſoever is propoſed by God's Church as a Point of Faith, is infallibly a truth revealed by God; it followeth that whoſoever denyeth any ſuch Point, oppoſeth God's ſacred teſtimony, whether that Point be contained in the Creed, or no. In vain then, was your care imployed to prove that all Points of Faith neceſſary to be *explicitely* believed, are contained in the Creed. Neither was that the Catalogue which *Charity Miſtaken* demanded. His demand was (and it was moſt reaſonable) that you would once give us a Liſt of all Fundamentals, the denyal whereof deſtroyes Salvation; whereas the denyal of other Points not Fundamental may ſtand with Salvation, although both theſe kinds of Points be equally propoſed as revealed by God. For if they be not equally propoſed, the difference will ariſe from diverſity of the *Propoſal*, and not of the *Matter* fundamental, or not fundamental. This Catalogue only, can ſhew how farre Proteſtants may diſagree without breach of Unity in Faith; and upon this, may other matters depend according to the ground of Proteſtants. But you will never adventure to publiſh ſuch a Catalogue. I ſay more: You cannot aſſigne any one Point ſo *great*, or fundamental, that the denyal thereof will make a man an Heretique, if it be not ſufficiently propounded, as a divine Truth: Nor can you aſſigne any one Point ſo *ſmall*, that it can without hereſie be rejected, if once it be ſufficiently repreſented as revealed by God.

2. Nay, this your inſtance in the Creed is not only impertinent, but directly againſt you. For all Points in the Creed are not of their own nature Fundamental, as I ſhewed (a) before: And yet it is damnable to deny any one Point contained in the Creed. So that it is cleer, that to make an error damnable, it is not neceſſary that the matter be of it ſelf fundamental. (a) *Cap. 3. n. 3.*

3. Moreover, you cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed it ſelf, unleſs firſt you preſuppoſe that the Authority of the Church is univerſally infallible, and conſequently that it is damnable to oppoſe her Declarations, whether they concerne matters great, or ſmall, contained, or not contained in the Creed. This is clear. Becauſe we muſt receive the Creed it ſelf upon the credit of the Church, without which we could not know that there was any ſuch thing as that which We call the *Apoſtles Creed*: and yet the Arguments whereby you endeavour to prove, that the Creed contains all Fundamental Points, are grounded upon ſuppoſition, that the *Creed* was made *either by the Apoſtles themſelves, or by the* (b) *Church of their times from them*: which thing we could not certainly know, if the ſucceeding and ſtill continued Church, may err in her Traditions: neither can we be aſſured, whether all Fundamental Articles which you ſay were out of the Scriptures, *ſummed, and contracted into the Apoſtles Creed*, were faithfully ſummed, and contracted, and not one pretermitted, altered, or miſtaken, unleſs we undoubtedly know that the Apoſtles compoſed the Creed; and *that* they intended to contract all Fundamental Points of Faith into it; or at leaſt *that the Church of their times* (for it ſeemeth you doubt whether indeed (b) *Pag. 216.*

indeed it were compoſed by the Apoſtles themſelves) did underſtand the Apoſtles aright; and *that the Church of their times*, did intend that the Creed ſhould contain all Fundamental Points. For if the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, may ſhe not alſo err in the particulars which I have ſpecified? Can you ſhew it to be a Fundamental Point of Faith, that the Apoſtles intended to comprize all Points of Faith neceſſary to Salvation in the Creed? Your ſelf ſay no more than that it is very (c) *probable*; which is far from reaching to a Fundamental Point of Faith. Your probability is grounded upon *the Judgment of Antiquity, and even of the* Roman *Doctors*, as you ſay in the ſame place. But if the Catholique Church may err, what certainty can you expect from Antiquity, or Doctors? Scripture is *your* total Rule of Faith. Cite therefore ſome Text of Scripture, to prove that the Apoſtles, or *the Church of their times*, compoſed the Creed, and compoſed it with a purpoſe that it ſhould contain all Fundamental Points of Faith. Which being impoſſible to be done, you muſt for the Creed it ſelf relie upon the infallibility of the Church.

(c) *Pag.* 241.

4. Moreover, the Creed conſiſteth not ſo much in the words, as in their ſenſe and meaning. All ſuch as pretend to the name of Chriſtians, recite the Creed, and yet many have erred fundamentally, as well againſt the Articles of the Creed, as other Points of Faith. It is then very frivolous to ſay, The Creed containes all Fundamental Points, without ſpecifying, both in what ſenſe the Articles of the Creed be *true*, and alſo in what *true* ſenſe, they be *fundamental*. For, both theſe taskes, you are to perform, who teach that all Truth is not Fundamental: and you do but delude the ignorant, when you ſay, that the Creed, *taken in a Catholique* (e) *ſenſe*, comprehendeth all Points Fundamental; becauſe, with you, all *Catholique ſenſe* is not Fundamental: for ſo it were neceſſary to Salvation that all Chriſtians ſhould know the whole Scripture, wherein every leaſt Point hath a *Catholique ſenſe*. Or if, by Catholique ſenſe, you underſtand that ſenſe which is ſo univerſally to be known, and believed by all, that whoſoever fails therein cannot be ſaved, you trifle, and ſay no more than this, *All Points of the Creed in a ſenſe neceſſary to Salvation, are neceſſary to Salvation.* Or, *All Points Fundamental, are Fundamental.* After this manner it were an eaſie thing to make many true Prognoſtications, by ſaying, It will certainly rain, when it raineth. You ſay the Creed (f) was opened and explaind, *in ſome parts* in the Creeds of *Nice*, &c. But how ſhall we underſtand the other *parts*, not explained in thoſe Creeds?

(d) *Pag.* 216.

(f) *Pag.* 216.

5. For what Article in the Creed is more Fundamental, or may ſeem more clear, than that, wherein we believe JESUS CHRIST to be the Mediatour, Redeemer, and Saviour of Man-kind, and the Founder and Foundation of a *Catholique Church* expreſſed in the Creed? And yet about this Article, how many different Doctrins are there, not only of old Heretiques, as *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutiches*, *&c.* but alſo Proteſtants, partly againſt Catholiques, and partly againſt one another? For the ſaid main Article of Chriſt's being the *only* Saviour of the world, &c. according to different ſenſes of diſagreeing Sects, doth involve theſe, and many other ſuch queſtions; That Faith in JESUS CHRIST doth juſtifie alone; that Sacraments have no efficiency in Juſtification; That Baptiſm doth not avail Infants for Salvation, unleſs they have an Act of Faith; That there is no Sacerdotal Abſolution from ſinnes; That good works proceeding from God's grace are not meritorious; That there can be no Satisfaction for the temporal puniſhment due to ſin, after the guilt or offence is pardoned; No Purgatory; No prayers for the dead; No Sacrifice of the Maſſe; No Invocation; No Mediation, or Interceſſion of Saints; No inherent Juſtice; No ſupream Paſtor, yea no Biſhop by divine Ordinance; No Real preſence; No Tranſubſtantiation, with divers others. And why? Becauſe (forſooth) theſe Doctrins derogate from the Titles of Mediator, Redeemer, Advocate, Foundation, &c. Yea, and are againſt the truth of our Saviours humane nature, if we believe divers Proteſtants, writing againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Let then any judicious man conſider, whether D. *Potter*, or others, do really ſatisfie, when they ſend men to the Creed for a perfect Catalogue, to diſtinguiſh Points Fundamental, from theſe which they ſay are not Fundamental. If he will ſpeak indeed to ſome purpoſe, let him ſay, This Article is underſtood in this ſenſe; and in this ſenſe it is fundamental. That other is to be underſtood in ſuch a meaning; yet according to that meaning, it is not ſo fundamental, but that men may diſagree, and deny it without damnation. But it were no policie for any Proteſtant to deal ſo plainly.

6. But to what end ſhould we uſe many arguments? Even your ſelfe are forced to limit your own Doctrin, and come to ſay, that the Creed is a perfect Catalogue of Fundamental Points, *taken as it was further opened and explained in ſome parts (by occaſion of emergent Hereſies) in the other Catholique Creeds of Nice, Conſtantinople,* (g) *Epheſus, Chalcedon, and Athanaſius.* But this explication, or reſtriction overthroweth your aſſertion. For as the Apoſtles Creed was not to us a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the firſt Councel, nor then till it was declared by another, *&c.* So now alſo, as new Hereſies may ariſe, it will need particular explanation againſt ſuch emergent errors; and ſo it is not yet, nor ever will be, of it ſelf alone, a particular Catalogue, ſufficient to diſtinguiſh betwixt fundamental, and not fundamental points.

(g) *Pag.* 216.

7. I come to the ſecond part: *That the Creed doth not contain all main and principal Points of Faith.* And to the end we may not ſtrive about things either granted by us both, or nothing concerning the point in queſtion, I muſt premiſe theſe Obſervations.

8. Firſt, That it cannot be denyed, but that the Creed is moſt full and complete, to that purpoſe for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpired by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular Points of Faith, but ſuch general heads, as were moſt befitting, and requiſite for preaching the Faith of Chriſt to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred. And therefore, in reſpect of Gentiles, the Creed doth mention God as Creator of all things; and for both Jews and Gentiles, the Trinity, the Meſſias, and Saviour, his birth, life, death, reſurrection, and glory, from whom they were to hope remiſſion of ſinnes, and life everlaſting, and by whoſe ſacred Name they were to be diſtinguiſhed from all other profeſſions, by being called Chriſtians. According to which purpoſe S. *Thomas of Aquine* (h) doth diſtinguiſh all the Articles of the Creed into theſe general heads: That ſome

(h) 2. 2. *q.* 1. *Art.* 8.

belong

belong to the Majesty of the *Godhead*, others to the Mysterie of our Saviour Christs *Humane nature*: Which two general objects of Faith, the holy Ghost doth expresse and conjoyn, *Joan* 17. *Hæc est vita æterna, &c. This is life everlasting, that they knowe thee true GOD, and whom thou hast sent JESUS CHRIST.* But it was not their meaning to give us as it were a course of Divinity, or a Catechisme or a particular expression of all Points of Faith, leaving those things to be performed, as occasion should require, by their own word or writing, for their time, and afterwards for their successors in the Catholique Church. Our question then is not, Whether the Creed be perfect, as farre as the end for which it was composed, did require; For we believe and are ready to give our lives for this; but only we deny, that the Apostles did intend to comprise therein all particular points of belief, necessary to Salvation, as even by D. *Potter*'s own (k) confession, it doth not comprehend *Agenda*, or things belonging to practice, as *Sacraments*, *Commandements*, the acts of *Hope*, and duties of *Charity*, which we are obliged not only to practise, but also to believe be divine infallible faith. Will he therefore infer that the Creed is not perfect, because it contains not all those necessary and fundamental Objects of Faith? He will answer, No, because the Apostles intended only to expresse *credenda*, things to be believed, not practised. Let him therefore give us leave to say, that the Creed is perfect, because it wanteth none of those Objects of belief which were intended to be set down as we explicated before.

(k) *Pag.* 235. 215.

9. The second Observation is, that to satisfie our question what Points in particular be fundamental, it will not be sufficient to alleage the Creed, unless it contains all such Points either expresly, and immediatly; or else in such manner, that by evident and necessary consequence they may be deduced from Articles both clearly, and particularly contained therein. For if the deduction be *doubtfull*, we shall not be *sure*, that such Conclusions be fundamental: or if the Articles themselves which are said to be fundamental, be not distinctly, and particularly expressed, they will not serve us to know, and distinguish all Points Fundamental, from those which they call, not Fundamental. We do not deny, but that all Points of Faith, both fundamental and not fundamental, may be said to be contained in the Creed, in some sense; as for example, implicitely, generally, or in such involved maner. For when explicitely believe the *Catholike Church*, we do not implicitely believe whatsoever she proposeth as belonging to Faith: Or else by way *reduction* that is when we are once instructed in the belief of particular Points of Faith, not expressed, nor by necessary consequence deducible from the Creed; we may afterward, by some analogie, or proportion, and resemblance, reduce it to one or moe of those Articles which are explicitely contained in the Symbole. Thus S. *Thomas*, the Cherubim among Divines, teacheth (l) that the miraculous existence of our blessed Saviours body in the *Eucharist*, as likwise all his other *miracles* are reduced to God's *Omnipotency*, expressed in the Creed. And D. *Potter* saith, *The Eucharist*, (m) *being a Seal of that holy union which we have with Christ our Head, by his Spirit and Faith, and with the Saints his Members by Charity, is evidently included in the Communion of Saints.* But this reductive way, is far from being sufficient to infer out of the Articles of *God's Omnipotency*, or of the *Communion of Saints*, that our Saviours body is in the Euchatist, and much less whether it be only in figure, or else in reality; by Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation, &c. and least of all, whether or no these Points be Fundamental. And you hyperbolize, in saying, the Eucharist is *evidently included in the Communion of Saints*, as if there could not have been, or was not, a Communion of Saints, before the blessed Sacrament was instituted. Yet it is true, that after we know, and believe, there is such a Sacrament, we may referre it to some of those heads expressed in the Creed, and yet so, as S. *Thomas* referrs it to one Article, and D. *Potter* to another; and in respect of different analogies or effects, it may be referred to several Articles. The like I say of other Points of Faith, which may in some sort be reduced to the Creed, but nothing to D. *Potter*'s purpose: But contrarily it sheweth, that your affirming such and such Points to be Fundamental or not Fundamental, is meerly arbitrary, to serve your turne, as necessity, and your occasions may require. Which was an old custome amongst Heretiques, as we read in (n) S. *Austin*; *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius*, *desiring fraudulently to avoid the hateful name of Heresies, affirmed that the question of Original sinne may be disputed without danger of faith.* But this holy Father affirmes that it belongs to the foundation of Faith. *We may* (saith he) *endure a disputant who errs in other questions not yet diligently examined, not yet diligently established by the whole Authority of the Church, their error may be borne with: but it must not pass so farre as to attempt to shake the Foundation of the Church.* We see S. *Augustine* placeth the being of a Point Fundamental or not Fundamental, in that it hath been *examined*, and *established* by the Church, although the Points of which he speaketh, namely, Original Sin, be not contained in the Creed.

(l) 2. 2. *q.* 1. *art.* 8. *ad* 6.

(m) *Pag.* 231.

(n) *De Peccat. Orig. li.* 2. *c* 22.

10. Out of that which hath been said, I infer, that D. *Potters* pains in alleaging Catholique Doctors, the ancient Fathers, and the Council of Trent, to prove that the Creed contains all Points of Faith, was needless; since we grant it in manner aforesaid. But D. *Potter* cannot in his conscience believe, that Catholique Divines, or the Council of Trent, and the holy Fathers did intend, that all Points in particular which we are obliged to believe, are contained explicitely in the Creed; he knowing well enough, that all Catholiques hold themselves obliged, to believe all those Points which the said Council define, to be believed under an Anathema, and that all Christians believe the Commandements, Sacraments &c. which are not expressed in the Creed.

11. Neither must this seem strange. For who is ignorant, that Summaries, Epitomes, and the like brief Abstracts, are not intended to specifie all particulars of that Science, or Subject, to which they belong. For as the Creed is said to contain all Points of *Faith*; so the Decalogue comprehends all Articles (as I may term them) which concern *Charity*, and good life: and yet this cannot be so understood, as if we were disobliged from performance of any duty, or the eschewing of any vice, unless it be expressed in the ten Commandements. For, (to omit the precepts of receiving Sacraments, which belong to practice, or manners, and yet are not contained in the Decalogue) there are many sins, even against the law of nature, and light of reason, which are not contained in the ten Commandements, except only by similitude, analogie, reduction, or some such way. For example, we we find not expressed

in

in the Decalogue, either divers sins, as Gluttony, Drunkennesse, Pride, Sloth, Covetuousnesse in desiring either things superfluous, or with too much greedinesse; or divers of our chiefe obligations, as Obedience to Princes, and all Superiours, not only Ecclesiastical, but also Civil, whose laws *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Calvin*, and some other Protestants do dangerously affirme not to oblige in conscience, and yet these men think they know the ten Commandements: as likwise divers Protestants defend Usury, to be lawful; and the many Treatises of *Civilians*, *Canonists*, and *Casuists* are witnesses, that divers sins against the light of reason, and Law of nature, are not distinctly expressed in the ten Commandements; although when by others diligence they are found unlawful, they may be reduced to some of the Commandements, and yet not so evidently, and particularly but that divers do it in divers manners.

12. My third Observation is, That our present question being Whether or no the Creed contain so fully all Fundamental Points of Faith, that whosoever do not agree in all, and every one of those Fundamental Articles, cannot have the same substance of Faith, nor hope of Salvation; if I can produce one, or more Points, not contained in the Creed, in which if two do not agree, both of them cannot expect to be saved, I shall have performed as much as I intend; and D. *Potter* must seek out some other Catalogue for Points Fundamental, than the Creed. Neither is it material to the said purpose, whether such Fundamental Points rest only in knowledge, and speculation, or belief, or else be farther referred to work and practice. For the *habit*, or vertue of *Faith*, which inclineth, and enableth us to believe both speculative and practical verities, is of one and the self same nature, and essence. For example, by the same *Faith*, whereby I speculatively believe there is a God, I likewise believe, that he is to be adored, served, and loved; which belong to practice. The reason is, because the *Formal Object*, or motive, for which I yeeld assent to those different sorts of material objects, is the same in both, to wit, the revelation, or Word of God. Where, by the way I note, that if the *unity*, or *Distinction*, and nature of Faith were to be taken from the diversity of things revealed, by one faith I should believe speculative verities and by another such as tend to practice, which I doubt whether D. *Potter* himself will admit.

13. Hence it followeth, that whosoever denyeth any one main practical revealed truth is no lesse an Heretique, than if he should deny a Point resting in belief alone. So that when D *Potter* (to avoid our argument, that all Fundamental Points are not contained in the Creed, because in it there is no mention of the Sacraments, which yet are Points of so main importance, that Protestants make the due administration of them, to be necessary and essential to constitute a Church) answereth, that the *Sacraments are to be* (p) *reckoned, rather among the* Agenda *of the Church, than the* Credenda; *they are rather Divine Rites and Ceremonies, than Doctrins*; he either grants what we affirm, or in effect sayes, Of two kinds of revealed Truths which are necessary to be believed, the Creed contains one sort only, *ergo*, it contains all kind of revealed Truths necessary to be believed. Our question is not, *de nomine*, but *re*; not what be called Points of Faith, or of Practice, but what Points indeed be necessarily to be believed, whether they be termed *Agenda*, or *Credenda*: especially the chiefest part of Christian perfection consisting more in Action, than in barren Speculation; in good works, than bare belief; in doing, than knowing. And there are no lesse contentions concerning practical, than speculative truths: as Sacraments, obtaining remission of sin, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for dead, Adoration of Christ in the Sacrament, and many other: all which do so much the more import, as on them, beside right belief, doth also depend our practice, and the ordering of our life. Though D. *Potter* could therefore give us (as he will never be able to do) a minute, and exact Catalogue of all Truths to be believed; that would not make me able enough to know, whether or no I have Faith sufficient for Salvation; till he also did bring in a particular List, of all believed Truths, which tend to practice, declaring which of them be fundamental, which not; that so every man might know, whether he be not in some *Damnable* Error, for some Article of Faith, which farther might give influence into *Damnable* works.

(p) *Pag.* 235.

14. These Observations being premised, I come to prove, that the Creed doth not contain all Points of Faith necessary to be known and believed. And, to omit, that in general it doth not tell us, what Points be fundamental, or not fundamental, which in the way of Protestants is most necessary to be known; in particular, there is no mention of the greatest evils, from which mans calamity proceeded, I mean, the sin of the Angels, of *Adam*, and of Original sin in us: nor of the greatest Good from which we expect all good, to wit, the necessity of *Grace* for all works tending to piety. Nay, there is no mention of Angels good or bad. The meaning of that most general head (*Oportet accedentem, &c. It behoves* (q) *him that comes to God, to believe that He is, and is a Remunerator*,) is questioned, by the denial of Merit, which makes God a Giver, but not a Rewarder. It is not expressed whether the Article of *Remission of sins* be understood by Faith alone, or else may admit the efficiency of Sacraments. There is no mention of Ecclesiastical, Apostolical, *Divine Traditions*, one way or other; or of holy Scriptures in general, and much lesse of every Book in particular; nor of the Name, Nature, Number, Effects, Matter, Forme, Minister, Intention, Necessity of Sacraments; and yet the due Administration of Sacraments, is with Protestants an essential Note, of the Church. There is nothing for Baptism of Children, nor against Re-baptization. There is no mention in favour, or against the Sacrifice of the Mass, of Power in the Church to institute Rites, Holy dayes, &c. and to inflict Excommunication, or other Censures: or Priesthood, Bishops, and the whole Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which are very Fundamental Points; of S. *Peters* Primacie, which to *Calvin* seemeth a fundamental error; not of the possibility, or impossibility to keep God's Commandements; of the procession of the holy Ghost from the Father and Sonne; of Purgatory, or Prayer for the dead, in any sense: And yet D. *Potter* doth not deny, but that *Aerius* was esteemed an Heretique, for denying (r) all sort of Com-

(q) *Heb.* 11. 6.

(r) *Pag.* 35.

Commemoration for the dead. Nothing of the Churches Visibility or Invisibility, Fallibility or Infallibility; nor of other Points controverted betwixt Protestants themselves, and between Protestants and Catholiques, which to D. *Potter* seem so hainous corruptions, that they cannot without damnation joyn with us in profession thereof. There is no mention of the Cessation of the Old Law, which yet is a very main Point of Faith. And many other might be also added.

15. But what need we labour to specifie particulars? There are as many important Points of Faith not expressed in the Creed, as since the worlds beginning, now, and for all future times there have been, are, and may be innumerable, gross, damnable Heresies, whose contrary truths are not contained in the Creed. For, every Fundamental Error must have a contrary Fundamental Truth; because of two contradictory Propositions in the same degree, if the one is false, the other must be true. As for example, if it be a damnable error to deny the blessed Trinity, or the Godhead of our Saviour, the *belief* of them must be a Truth necessary to Salvation; or rather, if we will speak properly, the *Error* is damnable, because the opposite *Truth* is necessary, as death is frightful, because life is sweet; and according to Philosophy, the Privation is measured by the Forme to which it is repugnant. If therefore the Creed contain in particular all fundamental Points of Faith, it must explicitely, or by cleer consequence, comprehend all Truths opposite to innumerable Heresies of all Ages past, present, and to come, which no man in his wits will affirm it to do.

16. And here I cannot omit to signifie how you (f) applaud the saying of D. *Usher*, *That in those Propositions which without all controversie are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much Truth is contained, as being joyned with holy Obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting Salvation; neither have we cause to doubt, but that as many as walk according to this Rule (neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any damnable heresies thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked conversation) peace shall be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.* Now D. *Potter* knows, that the Mystery of the B. Trinity is not universally received in the whole Christian world, as appears by very many Heretiques, in *Polony*, *Hungary*, and *Transilvania*, and therefore according to this Rule of D. *Usher*, approved by D. *Potter*, the denyal of the B. Trinity, shall not exclude Salvation. (f) *Pag.* 255.

17. Let me note, by the way, that you might easily have espied a foul contradiction in the said words of D. *Usher*, by you recited, and so much applauded. For he supposeth, that a man agrees with other Churches in belief, which joyned with holy Obedience may bring him to everlasting Salvation, and yet, that he may *superinduce damnable heresies*. For how can he *superinduce damnable heresies*, who is supposed to believe all *Truths* necessary to Salvation? Can there be any damnable heresie, unless it contradict some necessary Truth, which cannot happen in one who is supposed to believe all necessary *Truths*? Besides, if one believing all Fundamental Articles in the Creed may *superinduce damnable heresies*, it followeth, that the Fundamental Truths contrary to those damnable heresies, are not contained in the Creed.

18. According to this Model of D. *Potters* foundation, consisting in the agreement of scarce one Point of Faith; what a strange Church would he make of men concurring in some one or few Articles of belief, who yet for the rest should be holding conceits plainly contradictory: so patching up a Religion of men, who agree only in the Article, That Christ is our Saviour, but for the rest, are like to the parts of a Chimæra; having the head of a man, the neck of horse, the shoulder of an Oxe, the foot of a Lion, &c. I wrong them not herein. For in good Philosophie there is greater repugnancy between assent and dissent, affirmation and negation, *est, est, non, non*, (especially when all these contradictories pretend to relie upon one and the self same *Motive*, the infallible Truth of Almighty God) than between the integral parts, as head, neck, &c. of a man, horse, lion, &c. And thus Protestants are far more bold to disagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholique Divines in questions meerly Philosophical, or not determined by the Church. And while thus they stand only upon *fundamental* Articles, they do by their own confession destroy the Church, which is the *house of God*. For the *foundation* alone of a house is not a house, nor can they in such an imaginary Church any more expect Salvation, than the foundation alone of a house is fit to afford a man habitation.

19. Moreover, it is most evident that Protestants by this Chaos rather than Church, do give unavoidable occasion of desperation to poor souls. Let some one who is desirous to save his soul repair to D. *Potter*, who maintains these grounds, to know upon whom he may relie, in a matter of so great consequence; I suppose the Doctors answer will be, Upon the truely Catholique Church. She cannot erre damnably. What understand you by the Catholique Church? cannot general Councels, which are the Church *representative*, err? Yes, *they may weakly*, or (x) *wilfully misapply*, *or misunderstand*, *or neglect Scripture*, *and so err damnably*. To whom then shall I go for my particular instruction? I cannot conferr with the united body of the whole Church about my particular difficulties, as your self affirmes, that the Catholique Church *cannot be told* (u) *of private injuries*. Must I then consult with every particular person of the Catholique Church? So it seems by what you write in these words, *The whole* (w) *Militant Church (that is, all the members of it) cannot possibly err, either in the whole Faith, or any necessary Article of it*. You say M. *Doctor*, I cannot for my instruction acquaint the universal Church with my particular scruples: You say, the prelates of God's Church meeting in a lawful general Council may err damnably: It remains then that for my necessary instruction, I must repair to every particular member of the universal Church, spred over the face of the earth: and yet you teach that *the Promises* (x) *which our Lord hath made unto his Church for his assistance, are intended not to any particular persons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique*, with which (as I said) it is impossible for me to conferr. Alas! O most uncomfortable ghostly Father, you drive me to desperation! How shall I confer with every Christian soul, man and woman (t) *Pag.* 167. (u) *Pag.* 27. (w) *Pag.* 150. (x) *Pag.* 151.

woman, by ſea and by land, cloſe priſoner or at liberty? &c. Yet, upon ſuppoſal of this *miraculous* Pilgrimage for *Faith*, before I have the *faith* of *Miracles*, how ſhall I proceed at our meeting? Or how ſhall I know the man on whom I may ſecurely relie? Procure (will you ſay) to know whether he believe all Fundamental Points of Faith. For if he do, his faith, for point of belief, is ſufficient for Salvation, though he err in an hundred things of leſs moment. But how ſhall I know, whether he hold all Fundamental Points or no? For till you tell me this, I cannot know whether or no his belief be found in all Fundamental Points. Can you ſay the Creed? Yes and ſo can many damnable Hereticks. But why do you ask me this queſtion? Becauſe the Creed contains all fundamental Points of Faith.

(y) *Pag.* 241. Are you ſure of that? Not ſure: I hold it very probable. (y) Shall I hazard my ſoul on *probabilities*, or even wagers? This yeelds a new cauſe of diſpaire. But what? doth the Creed contain all Points neceſſary to be believed, whether they reſt in the underſtanding, or elſe do further extend to practice? No. It was compoſed to deliver *Credenda*, not *Agenda* to us; Faith, not *Practice*. How then ſhall I know what Points of belief, which direct my practice, be neceſſary to Salvation? Still you chalk out new paths for Deſperation. Well, are all Articles of the Creed, for their nature and matter, Fundamental? I cannot ſay ſo. How then ſhall I know which in particular be and which be not fundamental? Read my Anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet intituled *Charity Miſtaken, &c.* there you ſhall find, that fun-

(z) *Pag.* 211, 213, 214. damental Doctrins are ſuch *Catholique Verities, as principally and eſſentially pertain* (z) *to the Faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a Church, and are neceſſary* (*in ordinary courſe*) *to be diſtinctly believed by every Chriſtian that will be ſaved. They are thoſe grand, and capital Doctrins which make up our Faith in Chriſt; that is, that common Faith which is alike precious in all, being one and the ſame in the higheſt Apoſtle, and the meaneſt Believer, which the Apoſtle elſe-where cals the firſt Principles of the Oracles of God, and, the form of ſound words.* But how ſhall I apply theſe general definitions, or deſcriptions, or (to ſay the truth) theſe only varied words and phraſes (for I underſtand the word *fundamental*, as well as the word *principal, eſſential, grand, and capital doctrins*, &c.) to the particular Articles of the Creed, in ſuch ſort, as that I may be able preciſely, exactly, particularly, to diſtinguiſh Fundamental Articles from Points of leſs moment? You labour to tell us *what* Fundamental Points be, but not *which* they be: and yet unleſs you do this, your Doctrin ſerves only, either to make men diſpair, or elſe to have recourſe to thoſe whome you call Papiſts, and which give one certain Rule, that all Points defined by Chriſts viſible Church belong to the foundation of Faith, in ſuch ſenſe, as that to deny any one cannot ſtand with Salvation. And ſeeing your ſelf acknowledges that theſe men do not err in Points Fundamental, I cannot but hold it moſt ſafe for me to joyn with them, for the ſecuring of my ſoul, and the avoiding of deſperation, into which this your Doctrin muſt caſt all them who underſtand, and believe it. For the whole diſcourſe, and inferences which here I have made, are either your own direct Aſſertions, or evident Conſequences cleerly deduced from them.

20. But now let us anſwer ſome few Objections of D. *Potters*, againſt that which we have ſaid before, to avoid our argument, That the Scripture is not ſo much as mentioned in the Creed, he ſaith, *The Creed*

(a) *Pag.* 234. *is an abſtract of ſuch* (a) *neceſſary Doctrins as are delivered in Scripture*, or collected out of it; and therefore needs not expreſs the Authority of that which it ſuppoſes.

21. This Anſwer makes for us. For by giving a reaſon why it was needleſs that Scripture ſhould be expreſſed in the Creed you grant as much as we deſire, namely, that the Apoſtles judged it *needleſs* to expreſs all neceſſary Points of Faith in their Creed. Neither doth the Creed ſuppoſe, or depend on Scripture, in ſuch ſort as that we can by any probable conſequence, inferr from the Articles of the Creed, that there is any Canonical Scripture at all; and much leſs that ſuch Books in particular be Canonical. Yea, the Creed might have been the ſame, although holy Scripture had never been written; and, which is more, the Creed even in priority of time, was before all the Scripture of the New Teſtament; except the Goſpel of S. *Mathew*. And ſo, according to this reaſon of his, the Scripture ſhould not mention Articles contained in the Creed. And I note in a word, how little connexion D. *Potters*

(b) *Pag.* 234. arguments have, while he tels us, that *The Creed* (b) *is an abſtract of ſuch neceſſary Doctrins as are delivered in Scripture, or collected out of it, and therefore needs not expreſs the authority of that which it ſuppoſes*; it doth not follow: The Articles of the Creed are delivered in Scripture: therefore the Creed ſuppoſeth Scripture. For two diſtinct writtings may well deliver the ſame Truths, and yet one of them not ſuppoſe the other, unleſs D. *Potter* be of opinion that two Doctors cannot, *at one time*, ſpeake the ſame truth.

22. And notwithſtanding, that D. *Potter* hath now told us, it was *needleſs* that the Creed ſhould expreſs Scripture whoſe *Authority it ſuppoſes?* he comes at length to ſay, that the *Nicene Fathers in their Creed, confeſſing that the holy Ghoſt ſpake by the Prophets, doth thereby ſufficiently avow the divine Authority of all Canonical Scripture.* But I would ask him, whether the *Nicene* Creed be not alſo an Abſtract of Doctrins delivered in Scripture, as he ſaid of the Apoſtles Creed, and thence did infer, that it was needleſs to expreſs Scripture, *whoſe authority it ſuppoſes?* Beſides, we do not only believe in general, that Canonical Scripture is of divine Authority, but we are alſo bound under pain of damnation to believe, that ſuch and ſuch particular Books not mentioned in the *Nicene* Creed, are Canonical. And laſtly D. *Potter* in this anſwer grants as much as we deſire, which is, that all Points of Faith are not contained in the Apoſtles Creed, even as it is *explained* by other Creeds. For theſe words (*who ſpake by the Prophets*) are no waies contained in the Apoſtles Creed, and therefore contain an *Addition*, not an *Explanation* thereof.

23. But, *how can it be neceſſary* (ſaith D. *Potter*) *for any Chriſtian to have more in his Creed than the*

(c) *Pag.* 221. (c) *Apoſtles had, and the Church of their times?* I anſwer, You trifle, not diſtinguiſhing between the Apoſtles belief, and that abridgment of ſome Articles of Faith, which we call the Apoſtles *Creed*; and withall you beg the queſtion, by ſuppoſing that the Apoſtles believed no more, than is contained in their Creed, which every unlearned perſon knows and believes: and I hope you will not deny but the Apoſtles were endued with greater knowledg than ordinary perſons.

23. Your pretended proof out of the Acts, that the Apostles *revealed to the Church the whole counsel of God, keeping* (d) *back nothing* with your gloss (*needful for our Salvation*) is no proof, unless you still beg the question, and do suppose, that whatsoever the Apostles revealed to the Church, is contained in the Creed. And I wonder you do not reflect that those words were by S. *Paul* particularly directed to Pastors, and Governors of the Church, as is clear by the other words, *He called the Ancients of the Church.* And afterward, *Take heed to your selves, and to the whole flock wherein the holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops, to rule the Church.* And your self say, *that more knowledge is* (e) *necessary in Bishops, and Priests, to whom is committed the government of the Church, and the care of souls, than in vulgar Laicks.* Do you think that the Apostles taught Christians nothing but their Creed? Said they nothing of the Sacraments, Commandements, Duties of Hope, Charity, &c?

(d) *Act.* 20 27.

(e) *Pag.* 244.

25. Upon the same affected ambiguity is grounded your other Objection: *To say, the whole faith of those times* (f) *is not contained in the Apostles Creed, is all one, as if a man should say, This is not the Apostles Creed, but a part of it.* For the Faith of the Apostles is not all one with that which we commonly call their Creed. Did not, I pray you, S. *Mathew*, and S. *John* believe their writings to be Canonical Scripture? and yet their writings are not mentioned in the Creed. It is therefore more than clear that the Faith of the Apostles is of larger extent, than the Apostles Creed.

(f) *Pag.* 225, 223.

26. To your demand, Why amongst many things of equal *necessity to be believed, the Apostles should* (g) *so distinctly set down some, and be altogether silent of others?* I answer, That you must answer your own demand. For in the Creed there be divers Points, in their nature, not fundamental or necessary to be explicitely and distinctly believed, as above we shewed; Why are these Points which are not fundamental expressed, rather than other of the same quality? Why our Saviours descent to Hell, and Burial expressed, and not his Circumcision, his Manifestation to the three Kings, working of Miracles, &c? Why did they not express Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental Points of Faith tending to practice, as well as those which rest in belief? Their intention was, particularly to deliver such Articles as were fittest for those times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Messias, (as heretofore I have declared) leaving many things to be taught by the *Catholique Church*, which in the Creed we all profess to believe. Neither doth it follow, as you infer, *That as well, nay better, they might have given no Article, but that (of the Church) and sent us to the Church for all the rest. For in setting down others besides that, and not all, they make us believe we have all, when* (h) *we have not all.* For by this kind of arguing, what may not be deduced? One might, quite contrary to your inference, say, If the Apostles Creed contain all Points necessary to Salvation, what need we any Church to teach us? and consequently what need of the Article concerning the *Church*? What need we the Creeds of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, &c? Superfluous are your Catechisms, wherein, besides the Articles of the Creed, you adde divers other particulars. These would be poor consequences, and so is yours. But shall I tell you newes? For so you are pleased to esteem it. We grant your inference thus far; That our Saviour Christ referred us to his Church, by her to be taught, and by her alone. For she was before the Creed and Scripture; And she, to discharge this imposed office of instructing us, hath delivered us the Creed, but not it alone, as if nothing else were to be believed. We have, besides it, holy Scripture; we have unwritten, Divine, Apostolical, Ecclesiastical Traditions. It were a childish Argument, The Creed contains not all things which are necessary to be believed: *Ergo*, it is not profitable. Or, The Church alone, is sufficient to teach us by some convenient means: *Ergo*, she must teach us without all means, without Creeds; without Councils, without Scripture, &c. If the Apostles had expressed no Article, but that of the Catholique Church, she must have taught us the other Articles in particular, by Creeds, or other means as in fact we have even the Apostles Creed from the Tradition of the Church. If you will *believe you have all in the Creed, when you have not all*, it is not the Apostles, or the Church, that makes you to believe but it is your own error, whereby you will needs believe that the Creed must contain *all*. For neither the Apostles, nor the Church, nor the Creed it self tell you any such matter; and what necessity is there, that one means of instruction, must involve whatsoever is contained in all the rest? We are not to recite the Creed with anticipated perswasions, that it must contain what we imagine it ought, for better maintaining some opinions of our own; but we ought to say, and believe, that it contains what we find in it; of which one Article is, to believe the *Catholique Church*, surely to be taught by her, which presupposeth that we need other instruction beside the Creed: and in particular we may learn of her, what Points be contained in the Creed, what otherwise; and so we shall not be deceived, by beliving we have all in the Creed, when we have not all: and you may in the same manner say, *As well may betters, the Apostles might have given us no Articles* at all, as have left our Articles tending to practice. For in setting down the sort of Articles, and not the other, *they make us believe we have all, when we have not all.*

(g) *Pag.* 223.

(h) *Pag.* 223.

27. To our Argument, that Baptism is not contained in the Creed, D. *Potter*, besides his answer, that Sacraments belong rather to practice than faith, (which I have already confuted, and which indeed maketh against himself, and serveth only to shew that the Apostles intended not to comprize all Points in the Creed which we are bound to believe) adds, that the *Creed of* (i) *Nice expressed Baptism by name* [*confess one Baptism for the remission of sins.*] Which answer is directly against himself, and manifestly proves that Baptism is an Article of Faith, and yet is not contained in the Apostles Creed, neither explicitly, nor by any necessary consequence from other Articles expressed therein. If, to make it an Article of Faith, be sufficient that it is contained in the Nicene Council; he will find that Protestants maintain many errors against faith, as being repugnant to definitions of general Councils: as, in particular, that the very Council of *Nice*, which (saith M. *Whitgift*, (k) *is of all wise and learned men reverenced, esteemed, and embraced, next unto the Scriptures themselves*) decreed, that *to those who were chosen to the Ministry unmarried, it was not lawful to take any wife afterward*, is affirmed by Protestants. And your grand Reformer *Luther* (*libr. de Conciliis parte prima*) saith, that he understands not the holy Ghost in that Council. For in one Canon it saith that those who have gelded themselves are not fit to be

(i) *Pag.* 137.

(k) In his defence, *pag.* 330.

made Priests, in another it forbids them to have wives. *Hath* (saith he) *the holy Ghost nothing to do in Councels, but to bind and load his Ministers with impossible, dangerous, and unnecessary laws?* I forbear to shew that this very Article, *I confess one Baptism for the Remission of sins*, will be understood by Protestants in a far different sense from Catholiques; yea, Protestants among themselves do not agree, How Baptism forgives sins, nor what grace it conferrs. Only concerning the Unity of Baptism against re-baptization of such as were once baptized (which I noted as a Point not contained in the Apostles Creed) I cannot omit an excellent place of S. *Augustine*, where, speaking of the Donatists, he hath these words: *They are so bold as* (l) *to re-baptize Catholiques, wherein they shew themselves to be greater Heretiques, since it hath pleased the universal Catholique Church not to make Baptism void, even in the very Heretiques themselves.* In which few words, this holy Father delivereth against the Donatists these Points which do also make against Protestants: That to make an Heresie, or an Heretique, known for such, it is sufficient, to oppose the definition of God's Church: That a Proposition may be Heretical, though it be not repugnant to any Texts of Scripture. For S. *Augustine* teacheth that the doctrine of re-baptization is heretical, and yet acknowledgeth it cannot be convinced for such out of Scripture. And that, neither the Heresie of re-baptization of those who were baptized by Heretiques, nor the contrary Catholique truth being expressed in the Apostles Creed, it followeth that it doth not contain all Points of Faith necessary to Salvation. And so we must conclude that to believe the *Creed*, is not sufficient for Unity of Faith, and Spirit, in the same Church, unless there be also a total agreement both in *belief* of other Points of Faith, and in *external profession*, and Communion also (whereof we are to speak in the next Chapter) according to the saying of S. *Augustine*, *You are* (m) *with us in Baptism, and in the Creed; but in the Spirit of unity; and bond of peace, and lastly in the Catholique Church, you are not with us.*

(l) *Lib. de Heres. in 69.*

(m) *Aug. ep. 48.*

The ANSWER to the FOURTH CHAPTER.

Wherein is shewed, that the Creed contains all necessary Points of meer Belief.

1. AD q. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Concerning the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of Christianity, this is D. *Potter*'s Assertion, delivered in the 207. p. of his Book. *The Creed of the Apostles (as it is explained in the latter Creeds of the Catholique Church) is esteemed a sufficient Summary or Catalogue of Fundamentals, by the best learned Romanists, and by Antiquity.*

2. By *Fundamentals* he understands *not the Fundamental Rules of good life and action*, (though every one of these is to be believed to come from God, and therefore virtually includes an Article of Faith;) but the Fundamental *Doctrines of Faith*, such, as though they have influence upon our lives, as every essential doctrin of Christianity hath, yet we are commanded to believe them, and not to do them. The assent of our understandings is required to them, but no obedience from our wills.

3. But these speculative Doctrines again he distinguisheth out of *Aquinas*, *Occham*, and *Canus*, and others, into two kinds: of the first are those which are the *Objects of Faith, in, and for themselves*, which by their own nature and God's prime intention, are essential parts of the Gospel: such as the Teachers in the Church, cannot without Mortal sin omit to teach the learners: such as are intrinsecal to the Covenant between God and man; and not only plainly revealed by God, and so certain truths, but also commanded to be preacht to all men, and to be believed distinctly by all, and so *necessary truths*. Of the second sort are *Accidental, Circumstantial, Occasional* objects of Faith; millions whereof there are in holy Scripture; such as are to be believed, not for themselves, but because they are joyned with others, that are necessary to be believed, and delivered by the same Authority which delivered these. Such as we are not bound to know to be divine Revelations, (for without any fault we may be ignorant hereof, nay believe the contrary;) such as we are not bound to examine, Whether or no they

they be divine Revelations: such as Pastors are not bound to teach their Flock, nor their Flock bound to know and remember: no nor the Pastors themselves to know them or believe them, or not to disbelieve them absolutely and always; but then only when they do see, and know them to be delivered in Scripture, as divine Revelations.

4. I say when they do so, and not only when they may do. For to lay an obligation upon us of believing, or not disbelieving any Verity, sufficient Revelation on God's part, is not sufficient: For then, seeing all the expres Verities of Scripture are either to all men, or at least to all learned men sufficiently revealed by God, it should be a damnable sin, in any learned man actually to disbelieve any one particular Historical verity contained in Scripture, or to believe the contradiction of it, though he knew it not to be there contained. For though he did not, yet he might have known it; it being plainly revealed by God, and this revelation being extant in such a Book, wherein he might have found it recorded, if with diligence he had perused it. To make therefore any Points necessary to be believed, it is requisite, that either we actually know them to be divine Revelations: and these though they be not Articles of Faith, nor necessary to be believed, in and for themselves, yet indirectly, and by accident, and by consequence, they are so: The necessity of believing them, being inforced upon us by a necessity of believing this Essential, and Fundamental Article of Faith, *That all Divine Revelations are true*, which to disbelieve, or not to believe, is for any Christian not only impious, but impossible. Or else it is requisite that they be, First actually, revealed by God: Secondly, commanded under pain of damnation, to be particularly known (I mean known to be divine Revelations,) and distinctly to be believed. And of this latter sort of speculative divine Verities, D. *Potter* affirmed, *that the Apostles Creed was a sufficient summary*: yet he affirmed it, not as his own opinion, but as the doctrin of the *ancient Fathers, and your own Doctors*. And besides, he affirmed it not as absolutely certain, but very probable.

5. In brief, all that he says is this: It is *very probable, that according to the judgment of the* Roman *Doctors, and the Ancient Fathers, the Apostles Creed is to be esteemed a sufficient summary of all those Doctrines which being meerly* Credenda, *and not* Agenda, *all men are, ordinarily, under pain of damnation, bound particularly to believe.*

6. *Now this Assertion* (you say) *is neither pertinent to the question in hand, nor in it self true.* Your Reasons to prove it *impertinent*, put into form and divested of impertinencies, are these. 1. *Because the question was not, What Points were necessary to be explicitely believed, but what Points were necessary not to be disbelieved after sufficient proposal. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Points necessary to be explicitely believed, is impertinent.*

7. *Secondly, because errors may be damnable, though the contrary truths be not of themselves fundamental; as, that* Pontius Pilate *was our Saviours Judg, is not in it self a Fundamental Truth, yet to believe the contrary were a damnable error. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Truths in themselves fundamental, is no pertinent satisfaction to this demand, what errors are damnable?*

8. *Thirdly, because if the Church be not universally infallible, we cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed, which we must receive upon the credit of the Church: and, if the Church be universally infallible, it is damnable to oppose her declaration in any thing, though not contained in the Creed.*

9. *Fourthly, because not to believe the Articles of the Creed in the true sense is damnable, therefore it is frivolous to say, the Creed contains all Fundamentals, without specifying in what sense the Articles of it are fundamental.*

10. *Fifthly, because the Apostles Creed (as* D. Potter *himself confesseth) was not a sufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the first Councel; nor then until it was declared in the second, &c. by occasion of emergent Heresies: Therefore now also, as new Heresies may arise, it will need particular explanation; and so is not yet, nor ever will be, a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentals.*

11. Now to the first of these Objections I say, First, that your distinction between Points necessary to be believed, and necessary not to be disbelieved, is more subtil than sound; a distinction without a difference: There being no Point necessary to be believed, which is not necessary not to be disbelieved: Nor no Point to any man, at any time, in any circumstances, necessary not to be disbelieved, but it is to the same man, at the same time, in the same circumstances, necessary to be believed. Yet that which (I believe) you would have said, I acknowledge true, that many Points which are not necessary to be believed absolutely, are yet necessary to be believed upon a supposition, that they are known to be revealed by God: that is, become then necessary to be believed, when they are known to be Divine Revelations. But then I must needs say, you do very strangely, in saying, That *the Question was, What Point might lawfully be disbelieved, after sufficient Proposition that they are divine Revelation.* You affirm, that none may; and so doth D. *Potter*, and with him all Protestants, and all Christians. And how then *is* this the question? Who ever said or thought, that of Divine Revelations, known to be so, some might safely and lawfully be rejected, and disbelieved, under pretence that they are not Fundamental? Which of us ever taught, that it was not damnable, either to deny, or so much as doubt of the Truth of any thing, whereof we either know, or believe that God hath revealed it? What Protestant ever taught that it was not damnable, either to give God the lye, or to call his Veracity into question? Yet you say, *The demand of Charity Mistaken was, and it was most reasonable, that a List of Fundamentals should be given, the denial whereof destroys Salvation, whereas the denial of other Points may stand with Salvation, although both kinds be equally proposed, as revealed by God.*

12. Let the Reader peruse *Charity Mistaken*, and he shall find that this qualification, *although both kinds of Points be equally proposed as revealed by God*, is your addition, and no part of the demand. And if it had, it had been most unreasonable, seeing he and you know well enough, that (though we do not presently without examination, fall down and worship all your Churches Proposals, as divine Revelations) yet, we make no such distinction of known divine Revelations, as if some only of them were necessary to be believed, and the rest might safely be rejected. So that to demand a particular minute Catalogue of all Points that may not be disbelieved after sufficient Proposition, is indeed to demand a Catalogue of all Points that are or may be, in as much as none may be disbelieved, after sufficient Proposition, that it is a divine Revelation. At least it is to desire us, First, To transcribe into this Catalogue, every Text of the whole Bible. Secondly, to set down distinctly, those innumerous millions of negative and positive consequences, which may be evidently deduced from it: For these we say, God hath revealed. And indeed you are not ashamed in plain

terms

terms to require this of us. For having first told us, *that the command was What points were necessary not to be disbelieved, after sufficient proposition that they are Divine Truths*: you come to say, *Certainly the Creed contains not all these.* And this you prove by asking, *How many Truths are there in holy Scripture, not contained in the Creed, which we are not bound to know and believe, but are bound under pain of damnation not to reject, as soon as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture?* So that in requiring a particular Catalogue of all Points not to be disbelieved, after sufficient Proposal, you require us to set you down all Points contained in Scripture, or evidently deducible from it. And yet this you are pleased to call a *reasonable*, nay, *a most reasonable Demand*: whereas having ingaged your self to give a Catalogue of your Fundamentals, you conceive your ingagement very well satisfied by saying, *All is Fundamental which the Church proposeth*, without going about to give us an endless Inventory of her Proposals. And therefore from us, instead of a perfect Particular of Divine Revelations of all sorts, (of which with a less Hyperbole than S. *John* useth, we might say, *If they were to be written, the world would not hold the books that must be written*;) me-thinks you should accept of this general, All Divine Revelations are true, and to be believed. Which yet I say, not as if I thought the belief of this General sufficient to Salvation; but because I conceive it as sufficient as the belief of your General: and therefore I said not, *Me-thinks all should accept of this General*, but, *Me-thinks you should accept of it.*

13. The very truth is, The main Question in this business is not, *What divine Revelations are necessary to be believed, or not rejected when they are sufficiently proposed*: for all without exception, all without question are so; But *what Revelations are simply and absolutely necessary to be proposed to the belief of Christians, so that that Society, which doth propose, and indeed believe them, hath for matter of Faith, the essence of a true Church; that which doth not, hath not.* Now to this Question, though not to yours, D. *Potter*'s Assertion (if it be true) is apparently very pertinent. And though not a full and total satisfaction to it, yet very effectual, and of great moment towards it. For the main Question being, What Points are necessary to Salvation: and Points necessary to Salvation, being of two sorts, some of *simple belief*, some of *Practice and Obedience*, he that gives you a sufficient summary of the first sort of necessary Points, hath brought you half way towards your journies end. And therefore that which he doth, is no more to be slighted, as vain and impertinent, than an Architect's work is to be thought impertinent towards the making of a house, because he doth it not all himself. Sure I am, if his Assertion be true, as I believe it is, a Corollary may presently be deduced from it, which, if it were embraced cannot in all reason, but do infinite service, both to the Truth of Christ, and the peace of Christendom. For seeing falshood and errour could not long stand against the power of Truth, were they not supported by Tyranny and worldly advantages, he that could assert Christians to that liberty which Christ and his Apostles left them, must needs do Truth a most Heroical service. And seeing the overvaluing of the differences among Christians, is one of the greatest maintainers of the Schisms of Christendom, he that could demonstrate, that only those Points of Belief are simply necessary to Salvation, wherein Christians generally agree, should he

not lay a very fair and firm foundation of the peace of Christendom? Now the Corollary, which, I conceive, would produce these good effects, and which flows naturally from D. *Potter*'s Assertion, is this, *That what Man or Church soever believes the Creed, and all the evident consequences of it sincerely and heartily, cannot possibly (if also he believe the Scripture) be in any Error of simple belief which is offensive to God: nor therefore deserve for any such Error to be deprived of his life, or to be cut off from the Churches Communion, and the hope of Salvation.* And the production of this again would be this (which highly concerns the Church of *Rome* to think of,) *That whatsoever Man or Church doth for any error of simple belief, deprive any man so qualified as above, either of his temporal life, or livelihood, or liberty, or of the Churches Communion, and hope of Salvation, is for the first, unjust, cruel, and tyrannous: Schismatical, presumptuous, and uncharitable for the second.*

13. Neither yet is this (as you pretend) to take away the necessity of believing those verities of Scripture, which are not contained in the Creed, when once we come to know that they are written in Scripture, but rather to lay a necessity upon men of believing all things written in Scripture, when once they know them to be there written. For he that believes not all known Divine Revelations to be true, How doth he believe in God? Unless you will say, that the same man, at the same time, may not believe God, and yet believe in him. The greater difficulty is, How it will not take away the necessity of believing Scripture to be the Word of God? But that it will not neither. For though the Creed be granted a sufficient Summary of *Articles of meer Faith*, yet no man pretends that it contains the *Rules of obedience*; but for them, all men are referred to Scripture. Besides, he that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himself to believe it necessary to obey that which Reason assures him to be the Will of God. Now Reason will assure him that believes the Creed, that it is the Will of God he should believe the Scripture: even the very same Reason which moves him to believe the Creed: Universal, and never-failing Tradition, having given this testimony both to Creed and Scripture, that they both by the works of God were sealed, and testified to be the words of God. And thus much be spoken in Answer to your first Argument; the length whereof will be the more excusable, if I oblige my self to say but little to the Rest.

14. I come then *to your second.* And, in Answer to it, deny flatly, as a thing destructive of it self, that any Error can be damnable, unless it be repugnant immediatly or mediatly, directly or indirectly, of it self or by accident, to some Truth for the matter of it Fundamental. And to your example of *Pontius Pilat's being Judge of Christ*, I say, the denial of it in him that knows it to be revealed by God, is manifestly destructive of this Fundamental Truth, that *All Divine Revelations are true.* Neither will you find any error so much as by accident damnable, but the rejecting of it will be necessarily laid upon us, by a real belief of all Fundamentals, and simply necessary Truths. And I desire you would reconcile with this, that which you have said §. 15. *Every Fundamental Error must have a contrary Fundamental Truth, because, of two Contradictory Propositions, in the same degree, the one is false, the other must be true,* &c.

15. *To the Third* I answer, That the certainty I have of the Creed, that it

it was from the Apostles, and contains the Principles of Faith, I ground it not upon Scripture, and yet not upon the Infallibility of any present, much less of your Church, but upon the Authority of the Ancient Church, and written Tradition, which (as D. *Potter* hath proved) gave this constant testimony unto it. Besides, I tell you, it is guilty of the same fault which D. *Potter*'s Assertion is here accused of: having perhaps some colour toward the proving it false, but none at all to shew it impertinent.

16. *To the Fourth*, I answer plainly thus, that you find fault with D. *Potter* for his Vertues: you are offended with him for not usurping the Authority which he hath not; in a word, for not playing the *Pope*. Certainly, if Protestants be faulty in this matter, it's for doing it too much, and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon mens consciences together, under the equal penalty of death, and damnation; this Vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God, better than in the words of God: This Deifying our own Interpretations, and Tyrannous inforcing them upon others; This restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men, from that liberty, wherein Christ and the Apostles left them, (a) is, and hath been the only fountain of all the Schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which (as I said before) tears into pieces; not the coat, but the bowels, and members of Christ: *Ridente Turcâ nec dolente Judæo.* Take away these Walls of separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this *Persecuting*, *Burning*, *Cursing*, *Damning* of men for not subscribing to the *words of men*, as the words of God; Require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man Master but him only; Let those leave claiming Infallibility, that have no title to it; and let them that in their words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions. In a word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils instrument to support errors, and superstitions, and impieties, in the several parts of the world, which could not otherwise long withstand the power of Truth; I say, take away Tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only, and as Rivers when they have a free passage, run all to the Ocean, so it may well be hoped by God's blessing, that Universal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to Truth and Unity. These thoughts of peace (I am perswaded) may come from the God of peace, and to His blessing I commend them, and proceed.

(a) This perswasion is no singularity of mine, but the doctrin which I have learned from Divines of great learning and judgment. Let the Reader be pleased to peruse the seventh book of *Acont. de Strat. Satanæ* And *Zanch.* his last *Oration* delivered by him after the composing of the disco d between him and *Amerbachius*, and he shall confess as much.

18. *Your fifth and last Objection* stands upon a false and dangerous supposition: That *new Heresies may arise*. For an Heresie being in it self nothing else but a Doctrin Repugnant to some Article of the Christian Faith, to say that new Heresies may arise, is to say, that new Articles of Faith may arise: and so some great Ones among you stick not to profess in plain terms, who yet at the same time are not ashamed to pretend that your whole Doctrin is Catholique and Apostolique. So *Salmeron: Non omnibus omnia dedit Deus, ut quælibet ætas suis gaudeat veritatibus, quæs prior ætas ignoravit. God hath not given all things to All: So that every Age hath its proper verities, which the former Age was ignorant of*: Dis. 57. in Epist. ad *Rom.* And again in the Margent, *Habet unumquodque sæculum*

lum peculiares revelationes divinas, Every Age hath its peculiar Divine Revelations. Where that he ſpeaks of ſuch Revelations, as are, or may by the Church be made matters of Faith, no man can doubt that reads him; an example whereof, he give us a little before in theſe words, *Unius Auguſtini doctrina Aſſumptionis B. Deiparæ cultum in Eccleſiam introduxit. The Doctrin of* Auguſtine *only, hath brought into the Church the Worſhip of the Aſſumption of the Mother of God*, &c. Others again mince and palliate the matter with this pretence, that your Church undertakes not to coyn new Articles of Faith, but only to declare thoſe that want ſufficient Declaration. But if ſufficient declaration be neceſſary to make any Doctrin an Article of Faith, then this Doctrin, which before wanted it, was not before an Article of Faith; and your Church by giving it the Eſſential form, and laſt complement of an Article of Faith, makes it, though not a Truth, yet certainly an Article of Faith. But I would fain know, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles knew this Doctrin, which you pretend hath the matter, but wants the form of an Article of Faith, that is, *ſufficient declaration*, whether they knew it to be a neceſſary Article of the Faith, or no. If they knew it not to be ſo, then either they taught what they knew not, which were very ſtrange; or elſe they taught it not: and if not, I would gladly be informed, ſeeing you pretend to no new Revelations, From whom you learned it? If they knew it, then either they concealed or declared it. To ſay, they concealed any neceſſary part of the Goſpel, is to charge them with far greater ſacriledge, than what was puniſhed in *Ananias* and *Saphira*. It is to charge theſe glorious Stewards, and Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of Chriſt, with want of the great vertue requiſite in a Steward, which is *Fidelity*. It is to charge them with preſumption for denouncing Anathema's, even to Angels, in caſe they ſhould teach any other Doctrin, than what they had received from them, which ſure could not merit an Anathema, if they left any neceſſary part of the Goſpel untaught. It is in a word, in plain terms to give them the lye, ſeeing they profeſs plainly and frequently, that they taught Chriſtians the whole *Doctrin of Chriſt*. If they did know and declare it, then it was a full and formal Article of faith; and the conrrary a full and formal Hereſie, without any need of further declaration; and then their Succeſſors either continued the declaration of it, or diſcontinued it: If they did the latter, How are they ſuch faithful Depoſitaries of Apoſtolique Doctrin as you pretend? Or, what aſſurance can you give us. that they might not bring in new and falſe Articles, as well as ſuffer the old and true ones to be loſt? If they did continue the declaration of it, and deliver it to their Succeſſors, and they to theirs, and ſo on perpetually; then continued it ſtill a full and formal Article of Faith, and the repugnant doctrin a full and formal Hereſie, without and before the definition or declaration of a Councel. So that Councels, as they cannot make that a truth or falſhood, which before was not ſo: ſo neither can they make or declare that to be an Article of Faith, or an Hereſie, which before was not ſo. The ſuppoſition therefore on which this Argument ſtands, being falſe and ruinous, whatſoever is built upon it, muſt together with it fall to the ground. This explication therefore, and reſtriction of this doctrin, (whereof you make your advantage) was to my underſtanding unneceſſary. The Fathers of the Church in after-times might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgment, touching the ſenſe of ſome general Articles of the Creed:

Creed: but to oblige others to receive their declarations under pain of damnation, what warrant they had, I know not. He that can shew, either that the Church of all Ages was to have this Authority, or that it continued in the Church for some Ages, and then expired: He that can shew either of these things, let him: for my part, I cannot. Yet I willingly confess the judgment of a Councel, though not infallible, is yet so far directive, and obliging, that without apparent reason to the contrary, it may be sin to reject it, at least not to afford it an outward submission for publique peace sake.

19. *Ad §.7,8,9.* Were I not peradventure more fearful than I need to be of the imputation of tergiversation, I might very easily rid my hands of the remainder of this Chapter: For in the Question there discussed, you grant (for ought I see) as much as D. *Potter* desires; and D. *Potter* grants as much as you desire: and therefore that I should disease my self, or my Reader with a punctual examination of it, may seem superfluous. First, that which you would have, and which your Arguments wholly drive at, is this, That *the Creed doth not contain all main and principal points of Faith of all sorts, whether they be speculative, or practical,* whether they contain matter of simple belief, or whether they contain matter of practice and obedience. This D. *Potter* grants, *page* 215.235. And you grant that he grants it, §.8. Where your words are, *even by D.* Potter's *own confession, it (the Creed) doth not comprehend* Agenda, *or things belonging to practice, as Sacraments, Commandements, the Act of Hope, and duties of Charity.* And if you will inferr from hence, that therefore *C.M.* hath no reason to rest in the Apostles Creed, as a perfect catalogue of Fundamentals, and a full satisfaction to his demand, I have without any offence of D. *Potter*, granted as much, if that would content you. But seeing you go on, and, because his assertion is not (as neither is it pretended to be) a total satisfaction to the demand, cashеer it as impertinent, and nothing towards it, here I have been bold to stop your proceeding, as unjust and unreasonable. For, as if you should request a Friend to lend you, or demand of a debtor to pay you, a hundred pounds, and he could or should let you have but fifty, this were not fully to satisfie your demand, yet sure it were not, to do nothing towards it: Or, as this rejoynder of mine, though it be not an answer to all your Book, but only to the First considerable Part of it, and so much of the Second as is material, and falls into the first, yet I hope you will not deal so unkindly with me, as for this reason, to condemn it of impertinence: So D. *Potter* being demanded a Catalogue of Fundamentals of Faith, and finding them of two kinds, and those of one kind summ'd up to his hand in the Apostles Creed, and this Creed consigned unto him for such a summary by very great Authority; if upon these considerations he hath intreated his Demander to accept of thus much in part of payment, of the Apostles Creed, as a sufficient Summary of these Articles of Faith, which are *meerly Credenda*; me-thinks he hath little reason to complain, that he hath not been fairly, and squarely dealt with. Especially, seeing, for full satisfaction, by D. *Potter* and all Protestants he is referred to Scripture, which we affirm contains evidently all necessary points of Faith, and rules of obedience: and seeing D. *Potter* in this very place hath subjoyned, though not a Catalogue of Fundamentals, which (because to some more is Fundamental, to others less, to others nothing at all) had been impossible, yet such a comprehension of them, as may serve every one that will

make

make a conſcionable uſe of it, inſtead of a Catalogue. For thus he ſays, *It ſeems to be Fundamental to the Faith, and for the ſalvation of every Member of the Church, that he acknowledg and believe all ſuch Points of Faith, whereof he may be ſufficiently convinced that they belong to the Doctrin of Jeſus Chriſt.* This general rule, if I ſhould call a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I ſhould have a Preſident for it with you above exception, I mean your Self; for, *Chap.* 3. *Q.* 19. juſt ſuch another Propoſition you have called by this name. Yet becauſe it were a ſtrange figure of ſpeech, I forbear it; only I will be bold to ſay, that this Aſſertion is as good a Catalogue of Fundamentals, as any you will bring of your Church Propoſals, though you take as much time to do it, as he that undertook to make an Aſs ſpeak.

20. I come now to ſhew that you alſo have requited D. *Potter* with a mutual courteous acknowledgment of his Aſſertion, That the Creed is a ſufficient Summary of all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, which are meerly *Credenda.*

21. Firſt then, *Q.* 8. you have theſe words, *It cannot be denyed that the Creed is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe, for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpired by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular Points of Faith, but ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the Faith of Chriſt, to* Jews *and* Gentiles, *and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred.* Theſe words, I ſay, being fairly examined, without putting them on the rack, will amount to a full acknowledgment of D. *Potters* Aſſertion. But before I put them to the queſtion, I muſt crave thus much right of you, to grant me this moſt reaſonable poſtulate, that the Doctrine of *Repentance from dead works*, which S. *Paul* ſaith, was one of the two only things which he preacht, and the Doctrin of *Charity, without which* (the ſame S. *Paul* aſſures us that) *the knowledge of all myſteries, and all faith is nothing*, were Doctrins more neceſſary and requiſite, and therefore more fit to be preacht to *Jews* and *Gentiles* than theſe, *under what Judge our Saviour ſuffered*, that *he was buryed*, and *what time he roſe again*: which you have taught us, cap. 3. *Q.* 2. *for their matter and nature in themſelves not to be Fundamental.*

22. And upon this grant, I will ask no leave to conclude, that, whereas you ſay, *the Apoſtles Creed was intended for a comprehenſion of ſuch heads of faith, as were moſt befitting and requiſite, for preaching the faith of Chriſt, &c.* You are now, for fear of too much debaſing thoſe high Doctrins of Repentance and Charity, to reſtrain your Aſſertion, as D. *Potter* doth his, and (though you ſpeak indefinitely) to ſay you meant it, only of thoſe heads of Faith, which are *meerly Credenda.* And then the meaning of it (if it have any) muſt be this, That the Creed is full for the Apoſtles intent, which was to comprehend all ſuch general heads of Faith, which being points of *ſimple belief*, were moſt fit and requiſite to be preached to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred. Neither I nor you, I believe, can make any other ſenſe of your words then this. And upon this ground thus I ſubſume. But all the points of belief, which were neceſſary, under pain of damnation, for the Apoſtles to preach, and for thoſe to whom the Goſpel was preached, particularly to know and believe, were moſt fit and requiſite, nay more then ſo, neceſſary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles,

Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiously set down, and easily learned and remembred: Therefore the Apostle's intent by your confession was in this Creed, to comprehend all such points. And you say, *The Creed is most full and compleat, for the purpose which they intended.* The Major of this Syllogism is your own. The Minor, I should think, needs no proof, yet because all men may not be of my mind, I will prove it by its parts; and the first part thus,

There is the same necessity, for the doing of these things, which are commanded to be done, by the same Authority, under the same penalty.

But the same Authority, *viz.* Divine, under the same penalty, to wit, of damnation, commanded the Apostles to preach all these Doctrins which we speak of, and those to whom they were preached, particularly to know and believe them: For we speak of those only, which were so commanded, to be preached and believed.

Therefore all these points were alike necessary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles.

Now that all these Doctrins we speak of, may be briefly and compendiously set down, and easily learned and remembred, He that remembers, that we speak only of such Doctrins as are necessary to be taught and learned, will require hereof no farther demonstration. For, (not to put you in mind of what the Poet says, *Non sunt longa quibus nihil est quod demere possis,*) who sees not, that seeing the greatest part of men are of very mean capacities, that it is necessary that that may be learned easily, which is to be learned of all? What then can hinder me from concluding thus,

All the Articles of simple belief, which are fit and requisite to be preached, and may easily be remembred, are by your confession comprized in the Creed:

But all the necessary Articles of Faith are requisite to be preached, and easie to be remembred;

Therefore they are all comprized in the Creed:

Secondly, from grounds granted by you, I argue thus,

Points of belief in themselves Fundamental, are more requisite to be preached than those which are not so, (this is evident.)

But the Apostles have put into their Creed some Points that are not in in themselves Fundamental: (so you confess, *ubi supra.*)

Therefore if they have put in all, most requisite to be preached, they have put in all that in themselves are Fundamental.

Thirdly and lastly, from your own words, *p.* 26. thus I conclude for my purpose.

The Apostles intention was, particularly to deliver in the Creed such Articles as were fittest for those times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Messias; (Thus you: now I subsume,)

But all points simply necessary, by vertue of Gods command, to be preached and believed in particular, were as fit for those times as these here mentioned;

Therefore their intention was, to deliver in it particularly all the necessary points of Belief.

23. And certainly, he that considers the matter advisedly, either must say that the Apostles were not the Authors of it, or that this was their design

in

in compoſing it, or that they had none at all. For whereas you ſay, *Their intent was, to comprehend in it ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the Faith*; and elſewhere, *Particularly to deliver ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times*; Every wiſe man may eaſily ſee that your deſire here was, to eſcape away in a Cloud of indefinite terms. For otherwiſe, inſtead of ſuch general heads, and ſuch Articles, why did not you ſay plainly, All ſuch, or ſome ſuch? This had been plain dealing, but I fear, croſs to your deſign, which yet you have failed of. For that which you have ſpoken (though you are loath to ſpeak out) either ſignifies nothing at all, or that which I and D. *Potter*, affirm, *viz.* That the Apoſtles Creed contains all thoſe Points of Belief, which were by Gods command, of neceſſity to be preached to all, and believed by all. Neither when I ſay ſo, would I be ſo miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: For Punies in Logick, know that univerſal affirmatives, are not ſimply converted. And therefore it may be true, that all ſuch neceſſary points, are in the Creed; though it be not true, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: which I willingly grant, of the points by you mentioned. But this rather confirms, than any way invalidates my Aſſertion. For how could it ſtand with the Apoſtles wiſdom, to put in any points circumſtantial and not neceſſary, and, at the ſame time, to leave out any that were eſſential and neceſſary for that end, which you ſay, they propoſed to themſelves, in making the Creed, that is, *The preaching of the Faith to Jews and Gentiles?*

24. Neither may you hope to avoid the preſſure of theſe acknowledgments, by pretending as you do ℣ 10. that you do indeed acknowledge the Creed to contain all the neceſſary Articles of Faith; but yet ſo, that they are not either there expreſſed in it, or deducible from it, by evident conſequence, but *only by way of Implication or Reduction*. For firſt, not to tell you, that no Propoſition is implyed in any other, which is not deducible from it; nor ſecondly, that the Article of the Catholique Church, wherein you will have all implyed, implyes nothing to any purpoſe of yours, unleſs out of meer favour we will grant the ſenſe of it to be, that the Church is infallible, and that yours is the Church: to paſs by all this, and require no anſwer to it, this one thing I may not omit; that the Apoſtles intent was (by your own confeſſion) particularly to deliver in the Creed ſuch Articles of belief as were fitteſt for thoſe times (and all neceſſary Articles I have proved were ſuch:) now to deliver particularly, and to deliver only implicitely; to be delivered particularly in the Creed, and only to be reducible to it; I ſuppoſe are repugnancies hardly reconcileable. And therefore, though we deſire you, not to grant, that the Creed contains all Points of Faith of all ſorts, any other way than by implication or reduction, no, nor ſo neither; yet you have granted, and muſt grant, of the Fundamental Points of ſimple belief, thoſe which the Apoſtles were commanded in particular to teach all men, and all men in particular to know and believe, that theſe are delivered in the Creed, after a more particular and punctual manner, than implication or reduction comes to.

25. *Ad* ℣. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. It is vain for you to hope, that the teſtimonies of the Ancient and Modern Doctors, alleadged to this purpoſe by D. *Potter* in great abundance, will be turned off, with this general deceitful Anſwer, That the Allegation of them was needleſs to prove, that the Creed

Creed contains all Points of Faith, under pretence that you grant it in manner aforesaid. For what if you grant it in manner aforesaid, yet if you grant it not (as indeed you do but inconstantly in the sense which their testimonies require, then for all this their testimonies may be alleadged to very good purpose. Now let any man read them, with any tolerable indifference, and he shall find they say plainly, that all Points of Faith, necessary to be particularly believed, are explicitely contained in the Creed; and that your Gloss of Implication and Reduction, had it been confronted with their sentences, would have been much out of countenance, as having no ground nor colour of ground in them. For example, If *Azorius* had thought thus of it, how could he have called it, (a) *A brief comprehension of the Faith, and a sum of all things to be believed, and, as it were, a sign or cognizance whereby Christians are to be differenced and distinguished, from the impious and mis-believers, who profess either no faith, or not the right?* If *Huntly* had been of this mind, how could he have said of it with any congruity, (b *That the rule of Faith is expresly contained in it, and all the prime foundations of Faith:* And, *That the Apostles were not so forgetful as to omit any prime principal foundation of Faith in that Creed which they delivered to be believed by all Christians.* The words of *Filiucius* are pregnant to the same purpose, (c) *There cannot be a fitter Rule, from whence Christians may learn what they are explicitely to believe, than that which is contained in the Creed.* Which words cannot be justified, if all Points necessary to be believed explicitely, be not comprised in it. *To this end* (saith *Putean*) (d) *was the Creed composed by the Apostles, that Christians might have a form whereby they might profess themselves Catholiques.* But certainly, the Apostles did this in vain, if a man might profess this, and yet for matter of Faith be not a Catholique.

(a) *Azor part. 1. c. 5.*

(b) *Cont. 2. c. 10. n. 10.*

(c) *Moral. quest. Tr. 22 c. 2. n. 34.*

(d) *In 2. 2. qu. 2. Art. 3. Dubult.*

26. The words of *Cardinal Richelieu* (e), exact this sense, and refuse your gloss as much as any of the former: *The Apostles Creed is the Summary and Abridgement of that Faith which is necessary for a Christian; These holy persons being by the Commandement of Jesus Christ to disperse themselves over the world, and in all parts by preaching the Gospel to plant the Faith, esteemed it very necessary to reduce into a short sum, all that which Christians ought to know, to the end that being dispersed into divers parts of the world, they might preach the same thing in a short Form, that it might be the easier remembred. For this effect, they called this Abridgement a Symbole, which signifies a mark, or sign, which might serve to distinguish true Christians which imbraced it, from Infidels which rejected it.* Now I would fain know how the composition of the Creed could serve for this end, and secure the Preachers of it, that they should preach the same thing, if there were other necessary Articles not comprized in it. Or how could it be a sign to distinguish true Christians from others, if a man might believe it all, and for want of believing something else, not be a true Christian?

(e) *Instruction du Christien Lecon premiere.*

27. The words of the (f) *Author of the Consideration of four heads propounded* to *King James*, require the same sense, and utterly renounce your qualification. *The Symbole is a brief yet entire Methodical sum of Christian Doctrin, including all Points of Faith, either to be preached by the Apostles, or to be believed by their Disciples: Delivered both for a Direction unto them, what they were to preach, and others to believe, as also to discern and put a difference betwixt all faithful Christians and mis-believing Infidels.*

(f) *Ch. 3. Consid. 1. Sect 5. p. 119.*

(g) 2.2. *dis.* 1. *q.* 2. *p.* 4. *in fin.*

28. Lastly, (g) *Gregory of Valence* affirms our Assertion even in terms: *The Articles of Faith contained in the Creed, are, as it were, the first principles of the Christian Faith, in which is contained the sum of Evangelical Doctrin, which all men are bound explicitely to believe.*

29. To these Testimonies of your own Doctors, I should have added the concurrent Suffrages of the ancient Fathers, but the full and free acknowledgment of the same *Valentia* in the place above quoted will make this labour unnecessary. *So judg* (saith he) *the holy Fathers affirming that this Symbole of Faith was composed by the Apostles, that all might have a short sum of those things which are to be believed, and are dispersedly contained in Scripture.*

30. Neither is there any discord between this Assertion of your Doctors, and their holding themselves obliged to believe all the Points which the Council of *Trent* defines. For Protestants and Papists may both hold, that all Points of Belief necessary to be known and believed, are summed up in the Creed: and yet both the one and the other think themselves bound to believe whatsoever other Points they either know, or believe to be revealed by God. For the Articles which are necessary to be known that they are revealed by God, may be very few; and yet those which are necessary to be believed, when they are revealed and known to be so, may be very many.

31. But *Summaries and Abstracts are not intended to specifie all the particulars of the Science or Subject to which they belong.* Yes, if they be intended for perfect Summaries, they must not omit any necessary doctrin of that Science whereof they are Summaries; though the Illustration and Reasons of it they may omit. If this were not so, a man might set down forty or fifty of the principal Definitions and Divisions, and Rules of Logick, and call it a Summary or Abstract of Logick. But sure, this were no more a Summary, than that were the picture of a man in little, that wanted any of the parts of a man; or that a total sum, wherein all the particulars were not cast up. Now the Apostles Creed, you here intimate that it was intended for a Summary; otherwise why talk you here of Summaries, and tell us that they need not contain all the particulars of their Science? And of what I pray may it be a Summary, but of the Fundamentals of Christian Faith? Now you have already told us, *That it is most full and compleat to that purpose for which it was intended.* Lay all this together, and I believe the product will be, That the Apostles Creed is a perfect Summary of the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith; and what the duty of a perfect Summary is, I have already told you.

32. Whereas therefore to disprove this Assertion, in divers particles of this Chapter, but especially the fourteenth, you muster up whole Armies of Doctrins, which you pretend are necessary, and not contained in the Creed; I answer, very briefly thus: That the Doctrins you mention, are either concerning matters of practice, and not simple Belief; or else they are such Doctrins wherein God hath not so plainly revealed himself, but that honest and good men, true Lovers of God and of Truth, those that desire above all things to know his will and do it, may err, and yet commit no sin at all, or only a sin of infirmity, and not destructive of Salvation; or lastly, they are such Doctrins which God hath plainly revealed, and so are necessary to be believed, when they are known to be divine, but not necessary

necessary to be known and believed; not necessary to be known for divine, that they may be believed. Now all these sorts of Doctrins are impertinent to the present Question. For D. *Potter* never affirmed either that the necessary duties of a Christian, or that all Truths piously credible, but not necessary to be believed, or that all Truths necessary to be believed upon the supposal of divine Revelation, were specified in the Creed. For this he affirms, only of such speculative divine Verities, which God hath commanded particularly to be preached to all, and believed by all. Now let the Doctrins objected by you be well considered, and let all those that are reducible to the three former heads be discarded; and then of all these Instances against D. *Potter*'s Assertion, there will not remain so much as one.

33. First, the Questions touching the conditions to be performed by us to obtain remission of sins; the Sacraments; the Commandements, and the possibility of keeping them: the necessity of imploring the Assistance of Gods Grace and Spirit for the keeping of them: how far obedience is due to the Church: Prayer for the Dead: the cessation of the old Law, are all about *Agenda*, and so cut off upon the first consideration.

34. Secondly, the Question touching Fundamentals, is profitable, but not fundamental. He that believes all Fundamentals, cannot be damned for any error in Faith, though he believe more or less to be Fundamental than is so. That also of the procession of the Holy-Ghost from the Father and the Son, of Purgatory, of the Churches Visibility, of the Books of the New-Testament, which were doubted of by a considerable part of the Primitive Church: (until I see better reason for the contrary than the bare authority of men) I shall esteem of the same condition.

35. Thirdly, These Doctrins, That *Adam* and the Angels sinned: that there are Angels good and bad: that those Books of Scripture which were never doubted of by any considerable part of the Church, are the Word of God: that S. *Peter* had no such Primacy as you pretend: that the Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith, and consequently that no necessary Doctrine is unwritten: that there is no one Society or Succession of Christians absolutely infallible: These to my understanding are Truths plainly revealed by God, and necessary to be believed by them who know they are so. But not so necessary, that every man and woman is bound under pain of damnation particularly to know them to be divine Revelations, and explicitely to believe them. And for this reason, these with innumerable other Points, are to be referred to the third sort of Doctrins above-mentioned, which were never pretended to have place in the Creed. There remains one only Point of all that Army you mustered together, reducible to none of these heads, and that is, that God is, and is a Remunerator, which you say is questioned by the denyal of Merit. But if there were such a necessary indissoluble coherence between this Point and the Doctrine of Merit, me-thinks with as much reason, and more charity you might conclude, That we hold Merit, because we hold this Point; than that we deny this Point, because we deny Merit. Besides, when Protestants deny the Doctrine of Merits, you know right-well, for so they have declared themselves a thousand times, that they mean nothing else, but with *David*, that *their well-doing extendeth not is not truly beneficial, to God*: with our Saviour *when they have done all which they are commanded, they have done their duty only*, and no curtesie: And lastly, with S. *Paul*, that *all which they can suffer for God* (and yet suffering is more then

doing) *is not worthy to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed.* So that you must either misunderstand their meaning in denying Merit, or you must discharge their Doctrin of this odious consequence, or you must charge it upon *David*, and *Paul*, and *Christ* himself. Nay you must either grant their denial of true Merit just and reasonable; or you must say, that our good actions are really profitable to God: that they are not debts already due to him, but voluntary and undeserved Favours: and that they are equal unto and well worthy of eternal glory which is prepared for them. As for the inconvenience which you so much fear, That the denial of Merit makes God a Giver only, and not a Rewarder; I tell you, good Sir, you fear where no fear is: And that it is both most true on the one side, that you in holding good Works meritorious of eternal glory make God a Rewarder only and not a Giver, contrary to plain Scripture, affirming that *The gift of God is eternal life*; And that it is most false on the other side, that the Doctrin of Protestants makes God a Giver only and not a Rewarder; In as much as their Doctrin is, That God gives not Heaven but to those which do something for it, and so his Gift is also a Reward; but withal, that whatsoever they do is due unto God before-hand, and worth nothing to God, & worth nothing in respect of Heaven, and so mans work is no Merit, and Gods Reward is still a Gift.

36. Put the case the Pope, for a reward of your service done him in writing this Book, had given you the honor and means of a Cardinal, would you not, not only in humility, but in sincerity have professed, that you had not merited such a Reward? And yet the Pope is neither your Creator, nor Redeemer, nor Preserver, nor perhaps your very great Benefactor; sure I am, not so great as God Almighty, and therefore hath no such right and title to your service as God hath in respect of precedent Obligations. Besides, the work you have done him hath been really advantagious to him: and lastly not altogether unproportionable to the fore-mentioned Reward. And therefore if by the same work you will pretend that either you have or hope to have deserved immortal happiness, I beseech you consider well whether this be not to set a higher value upon a Cardinals cap, than a Crown of immortal glory, and with that Cardinal to prefer a part in *Paris*, before a part in *Paradise*.

37. In the next Paragraph you beat the air again, and fight manfully with your own shadow. The Point you should have spoken to, was this, That there are some Points of simple belief necessary to be explicitely believed, which yet are not contained in the Creed. Instead hereof you trouble your self in vain to demonstrate, That *many important Points of Faith are not contained in it*, which yet D. *Potter* had freely granted, and you your self take particular notice of his granting of it. All this pains therefore you have imployed to no purpose; saving that to some negligent Reader you may seem to have spoken to the very Point, because that which you speak to, at the first hearing, sounds somewhat near it. But such a one I must intreat to remember, there be many more Points of Faith, than there be Articles of Simple belief, necessary to be explicitely believed: And that though all of the former sort are not contained in the Creed, yet all of the latter sort may be. As for your Distinction between Heresies that have been, and Heresies that are, and Heresies that may be, I have already proved it vain; and that whatsoever may be an Heresie, that is so; and whatsoever is so, that alwayes hath been so, ever since the publication of the Gospel of Christ.

The

The Doctrine of your Church may like a Snow-ball increase with rowling, and again, if you please, melt away and decrease: But as *Christ Jesus*, so his Gospel, *is yesterday, and to day, and the same for ever.*

38. Our Saviour sending his Apostles to preach, gave them no other Commission than this, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy-Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.* These were the bounds of their Commission. If your Church have any larger, or if she have a Commission at large, to teach what she pleaseth, and call it the Gospel of Christ, let her produce her Letters-patents from heaven for it. But if this be all you have, then must you give me leave to esteem it both great sacriledge in you to forbid any thing, be it never so small or ceremonious, which Christ hath commanded; as the receiving of the Communion in both kinds: and as high a degree of presumption, to enjoyn men to believe, that there are or can be any other Fundamental Articles of the Gospel of Christ, then what Christ himself commanded his Apostles to teach all men; or any damnable Heresies, but such as are plainly repugnant to these prime Verities.

39. *Ad Q.* 16, 17. The saying of the most learned Prelate, and excellent man, the *Arch-Bishop of Armach*, is only related by D. *Potter*, p. 155. and not applauded: though the truth is, both the Man deserves as much applause as any man, and his saying as much as any saying; it being as great, and as good a Truth, and as necessary for these miserable times, as possibly can be uttered. For this is most certain, and I believe you will easily grant it, that to reduce Christians to Unity of Communion, there are but two ways that may be conceived probable: The one, by taking away diversity of Opinions touching matters of Religion: The other, by shewing that the diversity of Opinions, which is among the several Sects of Christians, ought to be no hinderance to their Unity in Communion.

40. Now the former of these is not to be hoped for without a miracle, unless that could be done, which is impossible to be performed, though it be often pretended; that is, unless it could be made evident to all men, that God hath appointed some visible Judge of Controversies, to whose judgement all men are to submit themselves. What then remains, but that the other way must be taken, & Christians must be taught to set a higher value upon these high Points of Faith and Obedience wherein they agree, than upon these matters of less moment wherein they differ; and understand, that agreement in those, ought to be more effectual to joyn them in one Communion, than their difference in other things of less moment to divide them? When I say, *in one Communion*, I mean, in a common Profession of those Articles of Faith, wherein all consent: A joynt-worship of God, after such a way as all esteem lawful; and a mutual performance of all those works of Charity, which Christians owe one to another. And to such a Communion what better inducement could be thought of, than to demonstrate that what was universally believed of al Christians, if it were joyned with a love of truth, and with holy obedience, was sufficient to bring men to heaven? For why should men be more rigid then God? Why should any error exclude any man from the Churches Communion, which will not deprive him of eternal Salvation? Now that Christians do generally agree in all those Points of Doctrin, which are necessary to Salvation, it is apparent, because they agree with one accord in believing all those Books of the Old & New

Teſtament, which in the Church were never doubted of to be the undoubted Word of God. And it is ſo certain that in all theſe Books, all neceſſary Doctrins are evidently contained, that of all the four Evangeliſts this is very probable, but of S. *Luke* moſt apparent, that in every one of their Books they have comprehended the whole ſubſtance of the Goſpel of Chriſt. For what reaſon can be imagined, that any of them ſhould leave out any thing which he knew to be neceſſary, and yet (as apparently all of them have done) put in many things which they knew to be only profitable and not neceſſary? What wiſe and honeſt man that were now to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, would do ſo great a work of God after ſuch a negligent faſhion? Suppoſe *Xaverius* had been to write the Goſpel of Chriſt for the *Indians*, think you he would have left out any Fundamental Doctrin of it? If not, I muſt beſeech you to conceive as well of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke*, and S. *John*, as you do of *Xaverius*. Beſides, if every one of them have not in them all neceſſary Doctrins, how have they complyed with their own deſign, which was, as the Titles of their Books ſhew, to write *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, and not a part of it? Or how have they not deceived us, in giving them ſuch Titles? By the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, I underſtand not the whole Hiſtory of Chriſt, but all that makes up the Covenant between God and man. Now if this be wholly contained in the Goſpel of S. *Mark*, and S. *John*, I believe every conſidering man will be inclinable to believe that then without doubt, it is contained, with the advantage of many other profitable things, in the larger Goſpels of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Luke*. And that S. *Mark*'s Goſpel wants no neceſſary Article of this Covenant, I preſume you will not deny, if you believe *Irenæus*, when he ſays, Matthew *to the Hebrews in their tongue publiſhed the Scripture of the Goſpel: When* Peter *and* Paul *did preach the Goſpel, and found the Church, or a Church at* Rome, *or of* Rome, *and after their departure* Mark *the ſcholar of* Peter, *delivered to us in writing thoſe things which had been preached by* Peter; *and* Luke, *and the follower of* Paul, *compiled in a Book the Goſpel which was preached by him: And afterwards* John, *reſiding in* Aſia, *in the City of* Epheſus, *did himſelf alſo ſet forth a Goſpel.*

41. In which words of *Irenæus*, it is remarkable that they are ſpoken by him againſt ſome Heretiques, that pretended (as you know who do now a-days) that *ſome neceſſary Doctrins of the Goſpel were unwritten*, and that *out of the Scriptures, truth* (he muſt mean ſufficient truth,) *cannot be found by thoſe which know not Tradition*. Againſt whom to ſay, that part of the Goſpel which was preached by *Peter*, was written by S. *Mark*, and ſome other neceſſary parts of it omitted, had been to ſpeak impertinently, and rather to confirm than confute their error. It is plain therefore, that he muſt mean, as I pretend, that all the neceſſary Doctrine of the Goſpel which was preached by S. *Peter*, was written by S. *Mark*. Now you will not deny, I preſume, that S. *Peter* preached all, therefore you muſt not deny that S. *Mark* wrote all.

42. Our next inquiry let it be touching S. *John*'s intent in writing his Goſpel, whether it were to deliver ſo much truth, as being believed and obeyed would certainly bring men to eternal life, or only part of it, and to leave part unwritten? A great man there is, but much leſs than the Apoſtle, who ſaith, that *writing laſt, he purpoſed to ſupply the defects of the other Evangeliſts that had wrote before him*: which (if it were true) would ſufficiently

ficiently justifie what I have undertaken, that at least all the four Evangelists have in them, all the necessary parts of the Gospel of Christ. Neither will I deny, but S. *John*'s secondary intent might be to supply the defects of the former three Gospels, in some things very profitable, But he that pretends, that any necessary Doctrine is in S. *John*, which is in none of the other Evangelists, hath not so well considered them as he should do, before he pronounce sentence of so weighty a matter. And for his prime intent in writing his Gospel, what that was, certainly no Father in the world understood it better than himself. Therefore let us hear him speak: *Many other signs* (saith he) *also did Jesus in the sight of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book: But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his Name.* By (*these are written*) may be understood either *these things* are written, or *these signs* are written. Take it which way you will, this conclusion will certainly follow, That either all that which S. *John* wrote in his Gospel, or less then all, and therefore all much more was sufficient to make them believe that, which being believed with lively faith, would certainly bring them to eternal life.

43. This which hath been spoken (I hope) is enough to justifie my undertaking to the full, that it is very probable that every one of the four Evangelists hath in his Book the whole substance, all the necessary parts of the Gospel of Christ. But for S. *Luke*, that he hath written such a perfect Gospel, in my judgment, it ought to be with them that believe him, no manner of question. Consider first the introduction to his Gospel, where he declares what he intends to write, in these words, *For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things, which are most surely believed amongst us, even as they delivered unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and Ministers of the Word, it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of things from the first, to write to thee in order, most excellent* Theophilus, *that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.* Add to this place, the entrance to his *History of the Acts of the Apostles: The former Treatise have I made, O* Theophilus, *of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up.* Weigh well these two places and then answer me freely and ingenuously to these demands. 1. Whether S. *Luke* doth not undertake the very same thing which he says, *many had taken in hand?* 2. Whether this were not *to set forth in order, a declaration of those things which are most surely believed amongst Christians?* 3. Whether the whole Gospel of Christ, and every necessary Doctrine of it, were not surely believed among Christians? 4. Whether they which were *Eye-witnesses and Ministers of the Word from the beginning, delivered not the whole Gospel of Christ?* 5. Whether he doth not undertake to write in order these things *whereof he had perfect understanding* from the first? 6. Whether he had not perfect understanding of the whole Gospel of Christ? 7. Whether he doth not undertake to write to *Theophilus* of all those things *wherein he had been instructed?* 8. And whether he had not been instructed in all the necessary parts of the Gospel of Christ? 9. Whether in the other Text, *All things which Jesus began to do and teach*, must not at least imply, all the Principal and necessary things? 10. Whether this be not the very interpretation of your Rhemish Doctors, in their Anno-

tation

tation upon this place? 11. Whether all these Articles of the Christian Faith, without the belief whereof, no man can be saved, be not the Principal and most necessary things which *Jesus* taught? 12. And lastly, Whether many things which S. *Luke* hath wrote in his Gospel, be not less principal, and less necessary, than all and every one of these? When you have well considered these proposals, I believe you will be very apt to think (if S. *Luke* be of credit with you) That all things necessary to salvation, are certainly contained in his writings alone. And from hence you will not chuse but conclude, that seeing all the Christians in the world, agree in the belief of what S. *Luke* hath written, and not only so, but in all other Books of Canonical Scripture, which were never doubted of, in and by the Church, the Learned Arch-Bishop had very just and certain ground to say, *That in these Propositions, which without Controversie are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained, as, being joyned with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting Salvation; and that we have no cause to doubt, but that, as many as walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any damnable Heresie thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy Faith, with a lewd and wicked conversation, peace shall be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.*

44. Against this, you object two things. The one, that by this Rule, *Seeing the Doctrin of the Trinity is not received universally among Christians, the denial of it shall not exclude Salvation.* The other; that *the Bishop contradicts himself, in supposing a man may believe all necessary Truths, and yet superinduce some damnable Heresies.*

45. To the first I answer, what I conceive he would, whose words I here justifie, that he hath declared plainly in this very place, that he meant, not an absolute, but a limited Universality. and speaks not of propositions universally believed by all Professions of Christianity that are, but only, by all those several Professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world. By which words he excludes from the universality here spoken of, the deniers of the Doctrin of the Trinity, as being but a handful of men, in respect of all, nay in respect of any of these Professions which maintain it. And therefore it was a great fault in you, either willingly to conceal these words, which evacuate your Objection, or else negligently to oversee them. Especially seeing your friend, to whom you are so much beholding, *Paulus Veridicus*, in his scurrilous and sophistical Pamphlet, against B. *Usher*'s Sermon, hath so kindly offered to lead you by the hand to the observation of them, in these words: *To consider of your* Coinopista, *or* communiter Credenda, *Articles, as you call them, universally believed of all these several Professions of Christianity, which have any large spread in the World: These Articles for example, may be the Unity of the Godhead, the Trinity of Persons, the immortality of the Soul,* &c. Where you see that your friend, whom you so much magnifie, hath plainly confessed, that notwithstanding the Bishop's words, the denial of the Doctrin of the Trinity may exclude Salvation; and therefore in approving and applauding his Answer to the Bishop's Sermon, you have unawares allowed this Answer of mine to your own greatest Objection.

46. Now for the foul contradiction, which you say the *Doctor* might easily have espyed in the Bishop's saying, he desires your pardon for his oversight,

ſight, for *Paulus Veridicus* his ſake; who though he ſet himſelf to find faults with the Biſhop's Sermon, yet it ſeems this he could not find, or elſe queſtionleſs we ſhould have heard of it from him. And therefore, if D. *Potter*, being the Biſhop's friend, have not been more ſharp-ſighted than his enemies, this, he hopes, to indifferent Judges will ſeem no unpardonable offence. Yet this I ſay, not as if there were any contradiction at all, much leſs any foul contradiction, in the Biſhop's words; but as *Antipheron*'s picture, which he thought he ſaw in the air before him, was not in the air but in his diſturbed phanſie: ſo all the contradiction which here you deſcant upon, is not indeed in the Biſhop's ſaying, but in your imagination. For wherein, I pray, lies this foul contradiction? *In ſuppoſing* (ſay you) *a man may believe all Truths neceſſary to ſalvation, and yet ſuperinduce a damnable Hereſie.* I anſwer, It is not certain that his words do ſuppoſe this: neither, if they do, doth he contradict himſelf. I ſay, it is not certain that his words import any ſuch matter. For ordinarily men uſe to ſpeak and write ſo, as here he doth, when they intend not to limit or reſtrain, but only to repeat, and preſs, and illuſtrate what they have ſaid before. And I wonder, why with your Eagles eyes you did not eſpy another foul contradiction in his words as well as this; and ſay, that he ſuppoſes a man may walk according to the rule of holy obedience, and yet vitiate his holy Faith with a lewd and wicked Converſation? Certainly, a lewd Converſation is altogether as contradictious to holy Obedience, as a damnable Hereſie to neceſſary Truth. What then was the reaſon that you eſpyed not this foul contradiction in his words as well as that? Was it becauſe, according to the Spirit and Genius of your Church, your zeal is greater to that which you conceive true doctrin, than holy obedience; and think ſimple error a more capital crime than ſins committed againſt knowledge and conſcience? Or was it becauſe your Reaſon told you, that herein he meant only to repeat and not to limit what he ſaid before? And why then had you not ſo much candour to conceive that he might have the ſame meaning in the former part of the disjunction; and intend no more but this, Whoſoever walks according to this rule of believing all neceſſary Truths and holy Obedience, (neither poyſoning his faith of thoſe Truths which he holds, with the mixture of any damnable Hereſie, nor vitiating it with a wicked life) Peace ſhall be upon him! In which words what man of any ingenuity will not preſently perceive that the words within the parentheſis, are only a repetition of, and no exception from, thoſe that are without? *S. Athanaſius* in his Creed tels us, *The Catholique Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance*; and why now do you not tell him that he contradicts himſelf, and ſuppoſes that we may worſhip a Trinity of Perſons, and one God in ſubſtance, and yet confound the Perſons, or divide the ſubſtance: which yet is impoſſible, becauſe Three remaining Three, cannot be confounded, and One remaining One cannot be divided? If a man ſhould ſay unto you, he that keeps all the Commandments of God, committing no ſin either againſt the love of God, or the love of his neighbour, is a perfect man: Or thus, he that will live in conſtant health had need be exact in his dyet, neither eating too much, nor too little: Or thus, he that will come to *London*, muſt go on ſtraight forward in ſuch a way, and neither turn to the right hand or to the left; I verily believe you would not

find

find any contradiction in his words, but confeſs them as coherent and conſonant as any in your Book. And certainly, if you would look upon this ſaying of the Biſhop with any indifference, you would eaſily perceive it to be of the very ſame kind, and capable of the very ſame conſtruction. And therefore one of the grounds of your accuſation is uncertain. Neither can you aſſure us, that the Biſhop ſuppoſes any ſuch matter as you pretend. Neither, if he did ſuppoſe this (as perhaps he did) were this to contradict himſelf. For though there can be no damnable Hereſie, unleſs it contradict ſome neceſſary Truth, yet there is no contradiction but the ſame man may at once believe this Hereſie and this Truth; becauſe there is no contradiction that the ſame man, at the ſame time, ſhould believe contradictions. For firſt, whatſoever a man believes true, that he may and muſt believe; But there have been ſome who have believed and taught that contradictions might be true, againſt whom *Ariſtotle* diſputes in the third of his *Metaphyſicks*; Therefore it is not impoſſible that a man may believe Contradictions. Secondly, they which believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, muſt believe that contradictions may be true: For otherwiſe there will be certainty in this Reaſon; This contradicts Truth, therefore it is falſe. But there be now divers in the world, who believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, (and whether you be of their mind or no, I deſire to be informed;) Therefore there be divers in the world who believe contradictions may be true. Thirdly, They which do captivate their underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which to their underſtanding ſeem irreconcileable contradictions, may as well believe real contradictions: (For the difficulty of believing ariſes not from their being repugnant, but from their ſeeming to be ſo:) But you do captivate your underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which ſeem to your underſtandings irreconcileable contradictions; Therefore it is as poſsible and eaſie for you to believe thoſe that indeed are ſo. Fourthly, ſome men may be confuted in their errors, and perſwaded out of them; but no mans error can be confuted, who together with his error doth not believe and grant ſome true Principle that contradicts his Error: for nothing can be proved to him who grants nothing, neither can there be (as all men know) any rational diſcourſe but out of grounds agreed upon by both parts. Therefore it is not impoſsible but abſolutely certain, that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions. Fifthly, It is evident, neither can you without extream madneſs and uncharitableneſs, deny that we believe the Bible, thoſe Books, I mean, which we account Canonical: Otherwiſe why diſpute you with us out of them, as out of a common Principle? Either therefore you muſt retract your opinion, and acknowledge that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions, or elſe you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to confeſs, that no part of our Doctrine contradicts the Bible. Sixthly, I deſire you to vindicate from contradiction theſe following Aſſertions: That there ſhould be Length and nothing long: Breadth, and nothing broad: Thickneſs, and nothing thick: Whiteneſs, and nothing white: Roundneſs, and nothing round: Weight, and nothing heavy: Sweetneſs, and nothing ſweet: Moiſture, and nothing moiſt: Fluidneſs, and nothing flowing: many Actions, and no Agent: many Paſsions, and no Patient: That is, that there ſhould be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, ſweet, moiſt, flowing, active, paſsive Nothing! That Bread ſhould be turned into the

ſubſtance

ſubſtance of Chriſt, and yet not any thing of the Bread become any thing of Chriſt; neither the matter, nor the form, nor the Accidents of Bread, be made either the matter, or the Form, or the Accidents of Chriſt. That Bread ſhould be turned into nothing, and at the ſame time with the ſame action turned into Chriſt, and yet Chriſt ſhould not be nothing. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have its juſt dimenſions, and juſt diſtance of its parts, one from another, and at the ſame time not have it, but all its parts together in one and the ſelf ſame point. That the body of Chriſt, which is much greater, ſhould be contained wholly and in its full dimenſions without any alteration, in that which is leſſer, and that not once only, but as many times over as there are ſeveral points in the Bread and Wine. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould be wholly above it ſelf, and wholly below it ſelf, within it ſelf, and without it ſelf, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about it ſelf. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould move to and from it ſelf, and lie ſtill: Or that it ſhould be carried from one place to another through the middle ſpace, and yet not move. That it ſhould be brought from heaven to earth, and yet not come out of Heaven, nor be at all in any of the middle ſpaces between Heaven and Earth. That to be one, ſhould be to be undivided from it ſelf, and yet that one and the ſame thing ſhould be divided from it ſelf. That a thing may be, and yet be no where. That a Finite thing may be in all places at once. That a Body may be in a place, and have there its dimenſions, and colour, and all other qualities, and yet that it is not in the power of God to make it viſible, and tangible there, nor capable of doing or ſuffering any thing. That there ſhould be no certainty in our ſenſes, and yet that we ſhould know ſomething certainly, and yet know nothing but by our ſenſes. That that which is, and was long ago, ſhould now begin to be. That that is now to be made of nothing, which is not nothing but ſomething. That the ſame thing ſhould be before and after it ſelf. That it ſhould be truly and really in a place, and yet without Locality. Nay, that he which is Omnipotent, ſhould not be able to give it Locality in this place, where it is, as ſome of you hold: Or, if he can, as others ſay he can, that it ſhould be poſſible, that the ſame man, for example You or I, may at the ſame time, be awake at *London*, and not awake but aſleep at *Rome*: There run or walk, here not run or walk, but ſtand ſtill, ſit, or lie along: There ſtudy or write; here, do neither, but dine or ſup: There ſpeak, here be ſilent. That he may in one place freeze for cold, in another place burn with heat. That he may be drunk in one place, and ſober in another: Valiant in one place, and a Coward in another: A Thief in one place, and honeſt in another. That he may be a Papiſt, and go to Maſs in *Rome*; A Proteſtant and go to Church in *England*. That he may die in *Rome*, and live in *England*: or dying in both places may go to Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven from *England*. That the Body and Soul of Chriſt ſhould ceaſe to be where it was, and yet not go to another place, nor be deſtroyed. All theſe, and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, and moſt of them the acknowledged Conſequences of your Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, as is explained one way or other by your School-men. Now I beſeech you, Sir, to try your skill, and, if you can compoſe their repugnance, and make peace between them, certainly, none but you ſhall be *Catholique Moderator*. But if you cannot do it, and that after an intelligible manner, then you muſt give

me

me leave to believe, that either you do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, or elſe that it is no contradiction, that men ſhould ſubjugate their underſtandings to the belief of contradictions.

47. Laſtly, I pray tell me whether you have not ſo much Charity in ſtore for the *Biſhop of Armach*, and D. *Potter*, as to think that they themſelves believe this ſaying, which the one preacht and printed, the other reprinted, and, as you ſay, applauded? If you think they do, then certainly, you have done unadviſedly, either in charging it with a foul contradiction, or in ſaying, it is impoſſible, that any man ſhould at once believe contradictions. Indeed that men ſhould not aſſent to contradictions, and that it is unreaſonable to do ſo, I willingly grant: But to ſay, it is impoſſible to be done, is againſt every mans experience, and almoſt as unreaſonable, as to do the thing which is ſaid to be impoſſible. For though perhaps it may be very difficult for a man in his right wits to believe a contradiction expreſſed in terms; eſpecially if he believe it to be a contradiction, yet for men being cowed and awed by ſuperſtition, to perſwade themſelves upon ſlight and trivial grounds, that theſe or theſe, though they ſeem contradictions, yet indeed are not ſo, and ſo to believe them: or if the plain repugnance of them, be veiled or diſguiſed a little, with ſome empty unintelligible non-ſenſe diſtinction; or if it be not expreſt but implyed, nor direct but by conſequence, ſo that the parties, to whoſe faith the propoſitions are offered, are either innocently, or perhaps affectedly ignorant of the contrariety of them: for men in ſuch caſes, eaſily to ſwallow and digeſt contradictions, he that denies it poſſible, muſt be a meer ſtranger in the world.

48. *Ad §.* 18. This Paragraph conſiſts of two immodeſt Untruths, obtruded upon us without ſhew, or ſhadow, of Reaſon: and an evident Sophiſm, grounded upon an affected miſtake of the ſenſe of the word *Fundamental*.

49. The firſt Untruth is, that D. *Potter makes a Church, of men agreeing ſcarcely in one Point of Faith: of men concurring in ſome one or few Articles of Belief, and in the reſt holding conceits plainly contradictory: Agreeing only in this one Article, that Chriſt is our Saviour; but for the reſt, like to the parts of a Chimæra*, &c. Which I ſay is a ſhameleſs calumny, not only becauſe D. *Potter* in this Point delivers not his own judgment, but relates the opinion of others, M. *Hooker*, and M. *Morton*; but eſpecially, becauſe even theſe men (as they are related by D. *Potter*) to the conſtituting of the very Eſſence of a Church, in the loweſt degree, require not only *Faith in Chriſt Jeſus the Son of God and Saviour of the World*, but alſo *ſubmiſſion to his Doctrin in mind and will*. Now I beſeech you Sir, tell me ingenuouſly, whether the Doctrin of Chriſt may be called without blaſphemy, *ſcarcely one Point of Faith?* or whether it conſiſts only, *of ſome one or few Articles of Belief?* Or whether there be nothing in it, but only this Article, *That Chriſt is our Saviour?* Is it not manifeſt to all the world, that Chriſtians of all Profeſſions do agree with one conſent, in the belief of all thoſe Books of Scripture, which were not doubted of in the Ancient Church, without danger of damnation? Nay, is it not apparent that no man at this time, can without hypocriſie, pretend to believe in Chriſt, but of neceſsity he muſt do ſo? Seeing he can have no reaſon to believe in Chriſt, but he muſt have the ſame to believe the Scripture. I pray then read over the Scripture once more, or, if that be too much labour, the New Teſtament only;

only; and then say, whether there be nothing there, but *scarcely one Point of Faith? But some one or two Articles of Belief? Nothing but this Article only, That Christ is our Saviour?* Say, whether there be not there an infinite number of Divine Verities, Divine Precepts, Divine Promises, and those so plainly and undoubtedly delivered, that if any sees them not, it cannot be because he cannot, but because he will not! So plainly, that whosoever submits sincerely to the Doctrin of Christ, in mind and will, cannot possibly but submit to these in act and performance. And in the rest, which it hath pleased God, for reasons best known to himself, to deliver obscurely or ambiguously, yet thus far at least they agree, that the sense of them intended by God, is certainly true, and that they are without passion or prejudice to endeavour to find it out: The difference only is, Which is that true sense which God intended. Neither would this long continue, if the walls of separation, whereby the Devil hopes to make their Divisions eternal, were pulled down; and error were not supported against Truth, by humane advantages? But for the present, God forbid the matter should be so ill as you make it! For whereas you looking upon their Points of difference and agreement, through I know not what strange glasses, have made the first innumerable, and the other scarse a number: the truth is clean contrary; That those Divine Verities Speculative and Practical, wherein they universally agree (which you will have to be but a few, or but one, or scarcely one) amount to *many millions*, (if an exact account were taken of them:) And on the other side, the Points in variance, are in comparison but few, and those not of such a quality, but the Error in them may well consist with the belief and obedience of the entire Covenant, ratified by Christ between God and man. Yet I would not be so mistaken, as if I thought the errors even of some Protestants unconsiderable things, and matters of no moment. For the truth is, I am very fearful, that some of their opinions, either as they are, or as they are apt to be mistaken, (though not of themselves so damnable, but that good and holy men may be saved with them, yet) are too frequent occasions of our remisness, and slackness, in running the race of Christian Profession, of our deferring Repentance, and Conversion to God, of our frequent relapses into sin, and not seldom, of security in sinning; & consequently, though not certain causes, yet too frequent occasions of many mens damnation: and such I conceive all these Doctrins, which either directly or obliquely, put men in hope of eternal happiness, by any other means saving only the narrow way *of sincere and universal obedience*, grounded upon a true and lively Faith. These errors therefore, I do not elevate or extenuate: and, on condition the ruptures made by them might be composed, do heartily wish, that the cement were made of my dearest bloud, and only not to be an Anathema from Christ: Only this I say, that neither are their Points of agreement so few, nor their differences so many, as you make them; nor so great as to exclude the opposite Parties from being Members of one Church Militant, and joynt-heirs of the glory of the Church Triumphant.

50. Your other palpable untruth is, that *Protestants are far more bold to disagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholique Divines* (you mean your own) *in Questions meerly Philosophical, or not determined by the Church.* For neither do they differ at all, in *matters of Faith*, if you take the word in the highest sense, and mean, by matters of Faith, such Doctrins as are

absolutely necessary to Salvation to be believed, or not to be dis-believed. And then in those wherein they do differ, with whatcolour or shadow of Argument, can you make good, that *they are more bold to disagree, than you are in Questions meerly Philosophical, or not determined by the Church?* For is there not as great repugnancy between your assent and dissent, your affirmation and negation, your *Est Est, Non Non*, as there is between theirs? You follow your Reason, in those things which are not determined by your Church; and they theirs, in things not plainly determined in Scripture. And wherein then consists their greater, *their far greater boldness*? And what if they in their contradictory opinions, pretend both to relie upon the truth of God, doth this make their contradictions ever a whit the more repugnant? I had always thought, that all contradictions had been equally contradictions, and equally repugnant; because the least of them are as far asunder as *Est* and *Non est* can make them, and the greatest are no farther. But then you in your differences, (by name, about Predetermination, the Immaculate Conception, the Pope's Infallibility) upon what other motive do you relie? Do not you cite Scripture, or Tradition, or both, on both sides? And do you not pretend, that both these are the infallible Truths of Almighty God?

51. You close up this Section with a fallacy, proving forsooth, that *we destroy, by our confession, the Church which is the house of God, because we stand only upon Fundamental Articles, which cannot make up the whole fabrick of the Faith, no more than the foundation of a house alone can be a house.*

52. But I hope, Sir, you will not be difficult in granting, that that is a house which hath all the necessary parts belonging to a house: Now by Fundamental Articles, we mean all those which are necessary. And you your self, in the very leaf after this, take notice that D. *Potter* doth so. Where to this Question, How shall I know in particular which Points be, and which be not Fundamental? You scurrilously bring him in making this ridiculous answer, *Read my Answer to a late Pamphlet intituled Charity Mistaken, &c. There you shall find that Fundamental Doctrins are such Catholick Verities, as principally, and essentially pertain to the Faith, such as properly constitute a Church, and are necessary (in ordinary course) to be distinctly believed by every Christian that will be saved.* All which words he used, not to tell what Points be Fundamental, as you dishonestly impose upon him, but to explain what he meant by the word Fundamental. May it please you therefore now at last, to take notice, that by *Fundamental*, we mean *all and only that which is necessary*; and then I hope you will grant, that we may safely expect Salvation in a Church which hath all things Fundamental to Salvation! Unless you will you say, that more is necessary, than that which is necessary.

53. *Ad §* 19. This long discourse, so full of un-ingenuous dealing with your adversary, perhaps would have done reasonably in a Farce or a Comedy, and I doubt not but you have made your self and your courteous Readers good sport with it. But if D. *Potter*, or I, had been by, when you wrote it, we should have stopt your carere at the first starting, and have put you in mind of these old School-Proverbs, *Ex falso supposito sequitur quodlibet*, and *Uno absurdo dato, sequuntur mille*. For whereas you suppose, first, that to a man desirous to save his soul, and requiring, whose direction he might rely upon, the Doctors answer would be, *Upon the truly Catholick Church*, I suppose

poſe upon better reaſon, becauſe I know his mind, that he would adviſe him to call *no man Maſter on Earth*, but, according to Chriſts command, to rely upon the direction of God himſelf. If he ſhould enquire, where he ſhould find this direction? He would anſwer him; In his Word contained in Scripture. If he ſhould enquire what aſſurance he might have, that the Scripture is the Word of God? He would anſwer him, that the doctrin it ſelf is very fit and worthy to be thought to come from God, *nec vox hominem ſonat*, and that they which wrote and delivered it, confirmed it to be the Word of God by doing ſuch works as could not be done, but by power from God himſelf. For aſſurance of the Truth hereof he would adviſe him to rely upon that, which all wiſe men in all matters of belief rely upon; and that is the conſent of Ancient Records, and Univerſal Tradition. And that he might not inſtruct him as partial in this advice, he might farther tell him, that a Gentleman that would be nameleſs, that has written a Book againſt him, called *Charity maintained by Catholiques*, though in many things he differ from him, yet agrees with him in this, that *Tradition is ſuch a principle as may be reſted in, and which requires no other proof*. As indeed no wiſe man doubts but there was ſuch a man as *Julius Cæſar*, or *Cicero*, that there are ſuch Cities as *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*, though he have no other aſſurance for the one or the other, but only the *ſpeech* of people. This tradition therefore he would counſel him to rely upon, and to believe that the Book which we call Scripture, was confirmed abundantly by the works of God, to be the Word of God. Believing it the Word of God, he muſt of neceſſity believe it true: and if he believe it true, he muſt believe it contains all neceſſary direction to eternal happineſs, becauſe it affirms it ſelf to do ſo. Nay, he might tell him that ſo far is the whole Book, from wanting any neceſſary direction to his eternal Salvation, that one only Author, that hath writ but too little Books of it, S. *Luke* by name, in the beginning of his *Goſpel*, and in the beginning of his *Story*, ſhews plainly that he alone hath written at leaſt ſo much as is neceſſary. And what they wrote, they wrote by Gods direction, for the direction of the world, not only for the Learned, but for all that would do their true endeavour to know the will of God, and to do it; therefore you cannot but conceive, that writing to all and for all, they wrote ſo as that in things neceſſary they might be underſtood by all. Beſides that, here he ſhould find, that God himſelf has engaged himſelf by promiſe, that if he would love him, and keep his Commandements and pray earneſtly for his Spirit, and be willing to be directed by it, he ſhould undoubtedly receive it, even the *Spirit of Truth which ſhall lead him into all truth*; that is certainly, at leaſt into all neceſſary Truths, and ſuffer him to fal into no pernicious error. The ſum of his whole direction to him briefly would be this, believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, uſe your true endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and to live according to it, and then you may reſt ſecurely that you are in the true way to eternal happineſs. This is the ſubſtance of that Anſwer which the Doctor would make to any man in this caſe; and this is a way ſo plain, that fools, unleſs they will, cannot err from it Becauſe, not knowing abſolutely all truth, nay not all profitable truth, and being free from errour; but endeavouring to know the truth and obey it, and endeavouring to be free from errour, is by this way made the only condition of Salvation. As for your ſuppoſition That he would adviſe ſuch a man to rely upon the Catholique Church for

the finding out the doctrin of Christ; he utterly disclaims it, and truly very justly: There being no certain way to know that any Company is a true Church, but only by their professing the true doctrin of Christ. And therefore as it is impossible I should know that such a company of Philosophers are Peripateticks, or Stoicks; unless I first know what was the doctrin of the Peripateticks, and Stoicks; so is it impossible that I should certainly know any company to be the Church of Christ, before I know what is the doctrin of Christ, the Profession whereof constitutes the visible Church, the Belief and Obedience the invisible. And therefore whereas you would have him be directed by the Catholique Church to the doctrin of Christ; the contrary rather is most certain and necessary, that by the fore-knowledg of the doctrin of Christ, he must be directed to a certain assurance, which is the Catholique Church, if he mean not to choose at a venture, but desire to have certain direction to it. This supposition therefore, being the hinge whereon your whole Discourse turns, is the *Minerva* of your own Brain; and therefore, were it but for this, have we not great reason to accuse you of strange immodesty, in saying as you do, That *the whole Discourse and Inferences which here you have made, are either* D. Potters *own direct assertions, or evident consequences clearly deduced from them?* Especially seeing your proceeding in it, is so consonant to this ill beginning, that it is in a manner wholly made made up, not of D. *Potters* assertions, but your own fictions obtruded on him.

54. To the next Question, *Cannot General Councils err?* You pretend he answers, *They may err damnably*. Let the Reader see the place, and he shall find, *damnably* is your addition. To the third Demand, *Must I consult*, (about my difficulties) *with every particular person of the Catholick Church?* You answer for him, (that which is most false) that *it seems so by his words; The whole militant Church, that is, all the members of it cannot possibly err either in the whole faith, or any necessary Article of it:* which is very certain, for should it do so, it should be the Church no longer. But what sense is there that you should collect out of these words, that every member of the militant Church must be consulted with? By like reason, if he had said that all men in the world cannot err; If he said that God in his own person, or his Angels could not erre in these matters, you might have gathered from hence, that he laid a necessity upon men in doubt, to consult with Angels, or with God in his own person, or with All men in the world. Is it not evident to all sober men, that to make any man or men fit to be consulted with, besides the understanding of the matter, it is absolutely requisite that they may be spoken with? And is it not apparently impossible, that any man should speak with all the members of the Militant Church? Or, if he had spoken with them All, know that he had done so? Nay does not D. *Potter* say as much in plain terms? Nay more, do not you take notice that he does so in the very next words before these, where you say, *he affirms that the Catholique Church cannot be told of private injuries:* unless you will perswade us there is a difference between the Catholique Church, and the whole Militant Church. For whereas you make him deny this of the Catholique Church united, and affirm it of the Militant Church dispersed into particulars; The truth is, he speaks neither of united nor dispersed, but affirms simply (as appears to your shame by your own quotations) that *the Catholique Church cannot be told of private injuries:* and then, that the

whole

whole Militant Church cannot erre. But then besides, that the united Church cannot be consulted, and the dispersed may, What a wild imagination is it? and what a strange injustice was it in you to father it upon him? I beseech you Sir, to consider seriously, how far blind zeal to your superstition hath transported you beyond all bounds of honesty and discretion, and made you careless of speaking either truth or sense, so you speak against D. *Potter!*

55. Again, you make him say, *The Prelates of Gods Church meeting in a lawful Council may erre damnably:* and from this you collect, *It remains then, for your necessary instruction you must repair to every particular member of the Universal Church spread over the face of the earth.* And this is also *Pergula pictoris, veri nihil, omnia ficta.* The Antecedent false (not for the matter of it, but) that D. *Potter* says it, And the consequence as far from it as *Gades* from *Ganges*; and as coherent as a rope of Sand. A general Council may err; therefore you must travel all the world over, and consult with every particular Christian! As if there were nothing else to be consulted with: Nay, as if according to the Doctrin of Protestants, (for so you must say,) there were nothing to be consulted with, but only, a general Council, or all the World! Have you never heard that Protestants say, That men for their direction must consult with Scripture? Nay, doth not D. *Potter* say it often in this very Book which you are confuting? Nay more, in this very page out of which you take this piece of your *Cento, A General Council may erre damnably?* are there not these plain words, *In searches of Truth* (he means divine Truth) *God ever directs us to the infallible Rule of Truth, the Scripture?* With what conscience then, or modesty, can you impose upon him this unreasonable consequence, and pretend that your whole discourse, is either his own direct assertions, or evident consequences, clearly deduced from them? You add, that yet he teaches (as if he contradicted himself) *that the promises of God made to the Church for his assistance, are not intended to particular persons, but only to the Catholick Church:* which sure agrees very well with any thing said by D. *Potter.* If it be repugnant to what you said for him falsely, what is that to him?

56. Neither yet is this *to drive any man to desperation:* unless it be such a one, as hath such a strong affection to this word, *Church*, that he will not go to Heaven, *unless he hath a Church to lead him thither.* For what though a Council may err, and the whole Church cannot be consulted with, yet this is not to send you on the Fool's *Pilgrimage for Faith*, and bid you go and *conferre with every Christian soul, man and woman, by Sea and by Land, close prisoner or at liberty*, as you dilate the matter: But to tell you very briefly, that Universal Tradition directs you to the Word of God, and the Word of God directs you to Heaven. And therefore here is no cause of desperation, no cause for you to be so vain, and tragical, as here you would seem. *Yet upon Supposal* (you say) *of this miraculous pilgrimage for Faith, before I have the Faith of Miracles, how shall I proceed at our meeting? Or how shall I know the man, on whom I may securely rely?* And hereunto you frame this Answer for the Doctor, *Procure to know whether he believe all Fundamental Points of Faith:* Whereas in all the Doctors Book, there is no such Answer to any such Question, or any like it. Neither do you, as your custom is, note any Page where it may be found;

which makes me ſuſpect, that ſure you have ſome private licence to uſe Paralogiſmes (as you call them) at your pleaſure, and make them anſwer any thing to any thing.

57. Wherein I am yet more confirmed, by the Anſwer you put in his mouth to your next demand, *How ſhall I know whether he hold all Fundamentall points or no?* For, whereas hereunto D. *Potter* having given one Anſwer fully ſatisfactory to it, which is, *If he truly believe the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, he cannot but believe all Fundamentals*; and another, which is but ſomething towards a full ſatisfaction of it, That *the Creed contains all the Fundamentals of ſimple Belief*: you take no notice of the former, and pervert the latter, and make him ſay, *The Creed contains all Fundamentalls of Faith*. Whereas you know, and, within ſix or ſeven lines after this, confeſs, that he never pretended it to contain *all ſimply*, but *all of one ſort*, all *neceſſary Points of ſimple belief*. Which aſſertion becauſe he modeſtly delivers as very probable (being willing to conclude rather leſs than more than his reaſons require,) hereupon you take occaſion to ask: *Shall I hazard my ſoul on probabilities, or even wagers!* As if, whatſoever is but probable, though in the higheſt degree of probability, were as likely to be falſe as true! Or becauſe it is but Morally, not Mathematically, certain that there was ſuch a Woman as Q. *Elizabeth*, ſuch a man as *H.* the 8. that is in the higheſt degree probable, therefore it were an even wager there were none ſuch! By this reaſon, ſeeing the truth of your whole Religion depends finally upon *Prudential motives*, which you do but pretend to be very credible, it will be *an even wager that your Religion is falſe*. And by the ſame reaſon, or rather infinitely greater, ſeeing it is impoſſible for any man (according to the grounds of your Religion) to know himſelf, much leſs another to be a true Pope, or a true Prieſt; nay, to have a Moral certainty of it; becauſe theſe things are obnoxious to innumerable ſecret and undiſcernable nullities, it will be an even wager, nay (if we proportion things indifferently,) a hundred to one, that every Conſecration and Abſolution of yours is void, and that whenſoever you adore the Hoſt, you and your Aſſiſtants commit Idolatry: That there is a nullity in any Decree that a Pope ſhall make, or any Decree of a Couucil which he ſhall confirm: Particularly, it will be, at leaſt any even wager, that all the Decrees of the Council of *Trent* are void, becauſe it is at moſt but very probable that the Pope which confirmed them was true Pope. If you miſlike theſe Inferences, then confeſs you have injur'd D. *Potter* in this alſo, that you have confounded and made all one, Probabilities, and even Wagers. Whereas every ordinary Gameſter can inform you, that though it be a thouſand to one that ſuch a thing will happen, yet it is not ſure, but very probable.

58. To make the meaſure of your injuſtice yet fuller, you demand, *If the Creed contains only points of ſimple belief, how ſhall you know what points of belief are neceſſary which direct our practiſe?* D. *Potter* would have anſwered you in our Saviours words, *Search the Scriptures*. But you have a great mind it ſeems to be diſpairing, and therefore, having propoſed your Queſtion, will not ſuffer him to give you Anſwer, but ſhut your ears and tell him, *ſtill he chalks out new paths for deſperation*.

59. In the reſt of your interlude, I cannot but commend one thing in you, that you keep a *decorum*, and obſerve very well the Rule given you by the great Maſter of your Art,

Servetur

Servius adjungit

Qualis ab incepto processerat, & sibi constat

One vein of scurrility and dishonesty runs clean through it, from the beginning to the end. Your next demand then is, *Are all the Articles of the Creed for their nature and matter Fundamental?* and the Answer, *I cannot say so.* Which Answer (though it be true) D. *Potter* no where gives it, neither hath he occasion, but you make it for him, to bring in another question: and that is, *How then shall I know, which in particular be and which be not Fundamental?* D. *Potter* would have answered, It is a vain question: believe all, and you shall be sure to believe all that is Fundamental.

60. But what says now his prevaricating Proxy? What does he make him say? This which follows: *Read my Answer to a late Popish Pamphlet intituled, Charity Mistaken: There you shall find that Fundamental doctrins are such Catholique verities, as principally and essentially pertain to the Faith, such as properly constitute a Church, and are necessary in ordinary course, to be distinctly believed by every Christian that will be saved. They are those Grand and Captital Doctrins which make up our Faith, that is, the Common Faith, which is alike pretious in all; being one and the same, in the highest Apostle, and the meanest believer, which the Apostle elsewhere cals, The first Principles of the Oracles of God, and, The form of sound words.*

61. But in earnest, Good Sir, doth the Doctor in these places by you quoted, make to this question this same foolish answer? Or do you think that against an Heretique nothing is unlawful? Certainly, if he doth answer thus, I will make bold to say, he is a very fool. But if he does not, (as indeed he does not) then ----: But I forbear you, and beseech the Reader to consult the places of D. *Potter*'s Book; and there he shall find, that, in the former half of these (as you call them) varyed words and phrases, he declared only what he meant by the word *Fundamental*, which was needful to prevent mistakes, and cavilling about the meaning of the word, which is metaphorical, and therefore ambiguous; and that the latter half of them, are several places of Scripture imployed by D. *Potter*, to shew that his distinction of Fundamental and not Fundamental hath expres ground in it. Now of these two places, very pertinent unto two very good purposes, you have exceeding fairly patcht together a most ridiculous Answer, to a Question, that D. *Potter* never dreamed of. *But the words*, you will say, *are in D.* Potters *Book, though in divers places, and to other purposes.* Very true: And so the words of *Ausonius* his obscene *Fescennine*, are taken out of *Virgil*, yet *Virgil* surely was not the Author of this Poem. Besides in D. *Potters* book, there are these words, *Dread Sovereign, amongst the many excellent vertues, which have made your Majesties person so dear unto God*, &c. And why now may you not say as well, that in these he made Answer to your former question, what Points of the Creed were, and what were not Fundamentals?

62. But *unless this question may be answered, his doctrin (you say) serves only either to make men despair, or else to have recourse to these, whom we call Papists.* It seems, a little thing will make you despair, if you be so sullen as to do so, because men will not trouble themselves to satisfie your curious questions. And I pray be not offended with me for so esteeming it, because, as before I told you, if you will believe all the Points of the Creed, you cannot choose but believe all the Points of it that are Fundamental, though you

you be ignorant which are so, and which are not so. Now, I believe, your desire to know which are Fundamentals, proceeds only from a desire to be assured that you do believe them; which seeing you may be assured of, without knowing which they be, what can it be but curiosity to desire to desire to know it? Neither may you think to mend your self herein one whit by having recourse to them whom we call Papists, for they are as far to seek as we in this Point, which of the Articles of the Creed are, for their nature, and matter, Fundamental, and which are not. Particularly, you will scarce meet with any amongst their Doctors, so adventurous as to tell you for a certain, Whether or no the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost, his being born of a Virgin, his Burial, his Descent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints, be Points of their own nature and matter Fundamental. Such I mean, as without the distinct and explicite knowledge of them no man can be saved.

63. But you will say, *at least they give this certain Rule, that all Points defined by Christ's visible Church, belong to the foundation of faith, in such sense, as, to deny any such, cannot stand with Salvation.* So also Protestants give you this more certain Rule, That whosoever believes heartily those books of Scripture, which all the Christian Churches in the world acknowledge to be Canonical, and submits himself indeed to this, as to the rule of his belief, must of necessity believe all things Fundamental; and, if he live according to his faith, cannot fail of Salvation. But besides, What certainty have you, that that rule of Papists is so certain? By the visible Church it is plain, they mean only their own: and why their own only should be the Visible Church, I do not understand: and as little, why all Points defined by this Church should belong to the foundation of faith. These things you had need see well and substantially proved, before you rely upon them, otherwise you expose your self to danger of imbracing damnable errors instead of Fundamental truths. But you will say, D. *Potter himself acknowledges, that you do not err in Fundamentals.* If he did so, yet me-thinks you have no reason to rest upon his acknowledgement with any security, whom you condemn of error in many other matters. Perhaps, excess of Charity to your persons, may make him censure your errors more favourably than he should do. But the truth is, and so I have often told you, though the Doctor hopes that your errors are not so unpardonably destructive, but that some men, who ignorantly hold them may be saved, yet *in themselves* he professes and proclaims them *damnable*, and such as, he fears, will be certainly destructive to such as you are, that is, to all those, *who have eyes to see and will not see them.*

64. *Ad §.* 20, 21, 22, 23. In the Remainder of this Chapter, you promise to answer D. *Potter*'s Arguments against that which you said before. But presently forgetting your self, instead of answering his Arguments, you fall a confuting his Answers to your own. The arguments objected by you which here you vindicate, were two. 1. *The Scripture is not so much as mentioned in the Creed, therefore the Creed contains not all things necessary to be believed.* 2. *Baptism is not contained in the Creed, therefore not all things necessary.* To both which Arguments my answer shortly is this, that they prove something, but it is that which no man here denies. For. D. *Potter* (as you have also confessed) never said, nor undertook to shew, that the Apostles intended to comprize in the Creed, all Points absolutely, which

we

we are bound to believe, or after sufficient proposal, not to disbelieve; which yet here and every where you are obtruding upon him: But only that they purposed to comprize in it, all such doctrines purely speculative, all such matters of simple belief, as are in ordinary course, necessary to be distinctly and explicitly believed by all men. Now neither of these objections do any way infringe or impeach the truth of this Assertion. Not the first, because according to your own doctrin, all men are not bound to know explicitely what books of Scripture are Canonical. Nor the second, because Baptism is not a matter of Faith, but practice: not so much to be believed, as to be given, and received. And against these Answers, whether you have brought any considerable new matter, let the indifferent Reader judge. As for the other things, which D. *Potter* rather glanceth at, than builds upon in answering these objections, as the Creeds being collected out of Scripture, and, supposing the Authority of it, which *Gregory* of *Valentia* in the place above cited, seems to me to confess, to have been the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers: and the *Nicene* Creeds intimating the authority of Canonical Scripture, and making mention of Baptism: These things were said *ex abundanti*; and therefore I conceive it superfluous to examine your exceptions against them. Prove that D. *Potter* did affirm that the Creed contains all things necessary to be believed of all sorts, and then these objections will be pertinent, and deserve an answer. Or produce some Point of simple belief, necessary to be explicitely believed, which is not contained either in terms, or by consequence in the Creed, and then I will either answer your Reasons, or confess I cannot. But all this while you do but trifle, and are so far from hitting the Mark, that you rove quite beside the Butt.

65. *Ad* §. 23, 24, 25. D. *Potter* demands, *How it can be necessary for any Christian to have more in his Creed than the Apostles had, and the Church of their times?* You Answer, *That he trifles, not distinguishing between the Apostles belief, and that abridgment of some Articles of faith, which we call the Apostles Creed.* I reply, that it is you which trifle, affectedly confounding (what D. *Potter* hath plainly distinguished) the Apostles belief of the whole Religion of Christ, as it comprehends both what we are to do, and what we are to believe, with their belief of that part of it, which contains not duties of obedience, but only the necessary Articles of simple Faith. Now though the Apostles Belief be, in the former sense, a larger thing than that which we call the Apostles Creed: yet in the latter sense of the word, the Creed (I say) is a full comprehension of their belief, which you your self have formerly confessed, though somewhat fearfully, and inconstantly: and here again unwillingness to speak the truth, makes you speak that which is hardly sense, and call it *an abridgement of some Articles of Faith.* For I demand, these *some Articles* which you speak of, Which are they? Those that are out of the Creed, or those that are in it? Those that are in it, it comprehends at large, and therefore it is not an abridgement of them: Those that are out of it, it comprehends not at all, and therefore it is not an abridgement of them. If you would call it now an abridgment of the Faith, this would be sense, and signifie thus much, That all the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith are comprised in it. For this is the proper duty of Abridgements, to leave out nothing necessary, and to take in nothing unnecessary.

66. Moreover,

66. Moreover, in answer to this demand you tell us, that *the Doctor begs the Question, supposing that the Apostles believed no more than is contained in their Creed.* I Answer, He supposes no such matter; but only that they knew no more necessary Articles of simple belief, than what are contained in their Creed. So that here you abuse D. *Potter* and your Reader, by taking sophistically without limitation, that which is delivered with limitation.

67. But this Demand of D. *Potter*'s, was equivalent to a Negation, and intended for one: *How can it be necessary for any Christian, to have more in his Creed, than the Apostles had?* All one with this, *It cannot be necessary*, &c. And this negation of his, he inforces with many arguments which he proposes by way of interrogation, thus. *May the Church of after Ages make the narrow way to Heaven, narrower than our Saviour left it? Shall it be a fault to straiten and encumber the King's high way with publique nuisances; and is it lawful by adding new Articles to the Faith, to retrench any thing from the Latitude of the King of Heavens high way to eternal Happiness? The yoke of Christ, which he said was easie, may it be justly made heavier by the Governors of the Church in after-ages? The Apostles profess they revealed to the Church the whole Counsel of God, keeping back nothing needful for our Salvation: What tyranny then, to impose any new unnecessary matters on the Faith of Christians, especially (as the late Popes have done) under the high commanding form,* Qui non crediderit, damnabitur? *If this may be done, Why then did our Saviour reprehend the Pharises so sharply, for binding heavy burdens, and laying them on mens shoulders? And why did he teach them, that in vain they worshipped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Traditions? And why did the Apostles call it tempting of God, to lay those things upon the necks of Christians, that were not necessary?*

68. All which Interrogations seem to me to contain so many plain and convincing Arguments of the premised Assertion; to all which (one excepted,) according to the advice of the best Masters of Rhetorick in such Cases, you have answered very discreetly, by saying O. But when you write again, I pray take notice of them: and, if you can devise no fair, and satisfying Answer to them, then be so ingenuous as to grant the Conclusion, That no more can be necessary for Christians to believe now, than was in the Apostles time. A conclusion of great importance, for the decision of many Controversies, and the disburdening of the Faith of Christ from many incumbrances.

69. As for that one, which you thought you could fasten upon, grounded on the 20. Act. 27. let me tell you plainly, that by your Answering this, you have shewed plainly that it was wisely done of you to decline the rest. You tell D. *Potter*, That *needful for salvation* is his gloss, which perhaps you intended for a piece of an Answer. But, good Sir, consult the place, and you shall find, that there S. *Paul* himself says that he kept back οὐδὲν τῶν συμφερόντων, *not any thing that was profitable*: and, I hope, you will make no difficulty to grant, that whatsoever is needful for salvation, is very profitable.

70. But then you say, *This is no proof unless he beg the Question, and suppose, that whatsoever the Apostles revealed to the Church is contained in the Creed.* I Answer, it is not D. *Potter* that begs the Question, but you that mistake it: which is not here in this particular place, Whether all Points

of

of ſimple Belief neceſſary for the ſalvation of the Primitive Chriſtians, were contained in the Apoſtles Symbol? (for that and the proofs of it follow after, in the next §. p. 223. of D. *Potter*'s Book): but, Whether any thing can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe now, which was not ſo from the beginning? D. *Potter* maintains the Negative; and to make good his opinion, thus he argues. S. *Paul* declared to the *Epheſians* the whole Counſel of God touching their Salvation; Therefore that which S. *Paul* did not declare, can be no part of the Counſel of God, and therefore not neceſſary. And again: S. *Paul* kept back nothing from the *Epheſians* that was profitable; Therefore he taught them all things neceſſary to ſalvation. Conſider this, I pray, a little better, and then, I hope, you will acknowledge, that here was no *Petitio principii*, in D. *Potter*, but rather *Ignoratio Elenchi*, in you.

71. Neither is it material, that theſe words were particularly directed by S. *Paul*, to the Paſtors of the Church: For (to ſay nothing that the Point here iſſuable, is not, Whom he taught, whether Prieſts or Laymen? But how much he taught, and whether all things neceſſary?) it appears plainly out of the Text, and I wonder you ſhould read it ſo negligently as not to obſerve it, that though he ſpeaks now to the Paſtors, yet he ſpeaks of what he taught not only them, but alſo the Laity as well as them. *I have kept back nothing* (ſays S. *Paul*) *that was profitable, but have ſhewed, and have taught you publikely, and from houſe to houſe; Teſtifying* (I pray obſerve) *both to the Jews, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And a little after, *I know that ye all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my face no more: Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am innocent from the blood of all men; for I have kept nothing back, but have ſhewed you all the Counſel of God.* And again, *Remember that by the ſpace of three years I ceaſed not to warn every one night and day with tears.* Certainly, though he did all theſe things to the Paſtors among the reſt; nay above the reſt, yet, without Controverſie, they whom he taught publikely, and from houſe to houſe: The *Jews* and *Greeks* to whom he teſtified, (1.) preached Faith and Repentance: Thoſe all, amongſt whom he went preaching the kingdom of God: Thoſe Every one, whom for three years together he warned, were not Biſhops and Paſtors only.

72. Neither is this to ſay, that the Apoſtles taught Chriſtians nothing but their Creed, nothing of the Sacraments, Commandments, *&c.* for that is not here the point to be proved: but only, that they taught them all things neceſſary, ſo that nothing can be neceſſary which they did not teach them. But how much of this they put into their Creed, Whether *all the neceſſary Points of ſimple Belief*, as we pretend, or only as you ſay, *I know not what*, is another Queſtion, and which comes now to be farther examined. D. *Potter* in confirmation of it, beſides the authorities which you formerly ſhifted off, with ſo egregious tergiverſation, urges five ſeveral Arguments.

73. The ſenſe of the firſt is this, *If all the neceſſary Points of ſimple Belief be not comprized in the Creed, it can no way deſerve the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as not being their Creed in any ſenſe, but only a part of it.* To this you Anſwer §. 25. *Upon the ſame affected ambiguity, &c.* Anſw. It is very true that their whole faith was of a larger extent, but that was not the Queſtion: But whether all the Points of ſimple belief which they taught

as neceſſary to be explicitely believed, be not contained in it? And if thus much at leaſt of Chriſtian Religion, be not comprized in it, I again deſire you to inform me, How it could be called the Apoſtles Creed!

74. Four other Reaſons D. *Potter* urges to the ſame purpoſe, grounded upon the practice of the Ancient Church; The laſt whereof you anſwer in the ſecond part of your Book. But to the reſt, drawn from the ancient Churches appointing her Infants to be inſtructed (for matters of ſimple belief,) only in the Creed: From her admitting Catechumens unto Baptiſm: and of Strangers to her Communion upon their only profeſſion of the Creed, you have not, for ought I can perceive, thought fit to make any kind of Anſwer.

75. The difficulties of the 27. and laſt §. of this Chapter, have been ſatisfied. So that there remains unexamined only the 26. *Section*, wherein you exceed your ſelf in Sophiſtry: Eſpecially in that trick of Cavillers, which is to anſwer objections by other objections; an excellent way to make controverſies endleſs! D. *Potter* deſires to be reſolved, *Why amongſt many things of equal neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould diſtinctly ſet down ſome in the Creed, and be altogether ſilent of others?* Inſtead of reſolving him in this difficulty, you put another to him, and that it is, *Why are ſome Points not Fundamental expreſſed in it, rather than others of the ſame quality?* Which demand is ſo far from ſatisfying the former Doubt, that it makes it more intricate. For upon this ground it may be demanded, How was it poſſible that the Apoſtles ſhould leave out any Articles ſimply neceſſary, and put in others not neceſſary, eſpecially if their intention were (as you ſay it was) to deliver it in ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times? Un'eſs (which were wondrous ſtrange) unneceſſary Articles were fitter for thoſe times, than neceſſary. But now to your Queſtion, the Anſwer is obvious: Theſe unneceſſary things might be put in, becauſe they were circumſtances of the neceſſary; *Pontius Pilate*, of Chriſt's Paſſion; The third day, of the Reſurrection. Neither doth the adding of them make the Creed ever a whit the leſs portable, the leſs fit to be underſtood, and remembred. And for the contrary reaſons, other unneceſſary things might be left out. Beſide, who ſees not, that the addition of ſome unneceſſary circumſtances is a thing that can hardly be avoided without affectation! And therefore not ſo great a fault, nor deſerving ſuch a cenſure, as the omiſſion of any thing eſſential to the work undertaken, and neceſſary to the end propoſed in it.

76. You demand again (as it is no hard matter to multiply demands) *Why our Saviour's deſcent to Hell, and Burial was expreſſed, and not his Circumciſion, his manifeſtation to the three Kings, and working of Miracles?* I anſwer: His Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and Sitting at the right hand of God are very great Miracles, and they are expreſſed. Beſides, S. *John* aſſures us, *That the Miracles which Chriſt did, were done and written not for themſelves that they might be believed*; but for a farther end, that *we might believe that Jeſus was the Chriſt, and believing have eternal life.* He therefore that believe this may be ſaved, though he have no explicite and diſtinct faith of any Miracle that our Saviour did. His Circumciſion and Manifeſtation to the Wiſe men (for I know not upon what grounds you call them *Kings*) are neither things ſimply neceſſary to be known, nor have any neer relation to thoſe that are ſo. As for his Deſcent into hell, it may

(for

(for ought you know) be put in as a thing neceſſary of it ſelf to be known. If you ask, why more than his Circumciſion? I refer you to the Apoſtles for an anſwer, who put that in, and left this out of their Creed: and yet ſure, were not ſo *forgetful after the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, as to leave out any prime and principal foundation of the Faith*, which are the very words of your own *Gordonius Huntlæus, Contr.* 2. *c.* 10. *num.* Likewiſe his Burial was put in perhaps as neceſſary of it ſelf to be known. But though it were not, yet hath it manifeſtly ſo near relation to theſe that are neceſſary, his Paſſion, and Reſurrection; being the Conſequent of the one, and the Antecedent of the other,) that it is no marvel if for their ſakes it was put in. For though I verily believe that there is no neceſſary Point of this nature, but what is in the Creed, yet I do not affirm, becauſe I cannot prove it, that there is nothing in the Creed but what is neceſſary. You demand thirdly, *Why did they not expreſs Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental Points of Faith tending to practice, as well as thoſe which reſt in Belief?* I anſwer; Becauſe their purpoſe was to comprize in it only thoſe neceſſary Points which reſt in Belief: which appears, becauſe of practical Points there is not in it ſo much as one.

77. D. *Potter* ſubjoyns to what is ſaid above, *That as well, nay better, they might have given no Article but that of the Church, and ſent us to the Church for all the reſt: For in ſetting down others beſides that, and not all, they make us believe we have all, when we have not all.* This conſequence you deny: and neither give reaſon againſt it, nor ſatisfie his reaſon for it, which yet in my judgment is good and concluding. The Propoſition to be proved is this: That, if your Doctrin were true, this ſhort Creed, *I believe the Roman Church to be infallible*, would have been better, that is, more effectual to keep the believers of it from Hereſie, and in the true Faith, than this Creed which now we have. A Propoſition ſo evident, that I cannot ſee how either you, or any of your Religion, or indeed any ſenſible man can from his heart deny it. Yet becauſe you make ſhew of doing ſo, or elſe, which I rather hope, do not rightly apprehend the force of the Reaſon, I will endeavour briefly to add ſome light and ſtrength to it, by comparing the effects of theſe ſeveral ſuppoſed Creeds.

78. The former Creed therefore would certainly produce theſe effects in the believers of it: An impoſſibility of being in any formal Hereſie: A neceſſity of being prepared in mind to come out of all Error in Faith, or material Hereſie; which certainly you will not deny; or, if you do, you pull down the only pillar of your Church and Religion, and deny that which is in effect the only thing you labour to prove through your whole Book.

79. The latter Creed which now we have, is ſo uneffectual for theſe good purpoſes, that you your ſelf tell us of innumerable, groſs, damnable Hereſies, that have been, are, and may be, whoſe contrary Truths are neither explicitly, nor by conſequence comprehended in this Creed: So that no man by the belief of this Creed without the former, can be poſſibly guarded from falling into them, and continuing obſtinate in them. Nay, ſo far is this Creed from guarding them from theſe miſchiefs, that it is more likely to enſnare them into them, by ſeeming and yet not being a full comprehenſion of all neceſſary Points of Faith: which is apt (as experience ſhews,) to miſ-guide men into this (as you conceive it) pernitious error,

That believing the Creed, they believe all necessary Points of Faith, whereas indeed, according to you, they do not so. Now upon these grounds I thus conclude: That Creed, which hath great commodities and no danger, would certainly be better than that which hath great danger, and wants many of these great commodities: But the former short Creed propos'd by me, *I believe the Roman Church to be infallible*, (if your doctrin be true) is of the former condition, and the latter, that is, the Apostles Creed, is of the latter, Therefore the former (if your doctrin be true) would without controversie be better than the latter.

80. But (say you) by this kind of arguing, one might infer quite contrary. *If the Apostles Creed contain all Points necessary to Salvation, What need have we of any Church to teach us? And consequently what need of the Article of the Church?* To which I answer, that having compared your inference and D. *Potter*'s together, I cannot discover any shadow of resemblance between them, nor any shew of Reason, why the perfection of the Apostles Creed, should exclude a necessity of some body to deliver it. Much less why the whole Creed's containing all things necessary should make the belief of a part of it unnecessary. As well (for ought I understand) you might avouch this inference to be as good as D. *Potters*: The Apostles Creed contains all things necessary, therefore there is no need to believe in God. Neither doth it follow so well as D. *Potter*'s Argument follows, That if the Apostles Creed contains all things necessary, that all other Creeds and Catechisms, wherein are added divers other Particulars, are superfluous. For these other Particulars may be the duties of obedience, they may be profitable Points of Doctrine, they may be good expositions of the Apostles Creed, and so not superfluous; and yet for all this the Creed may still contain all Points of Belief that are simply necessary. These therefore are poor consequences, but no more like D. *Potters* than an apple is like an oister.

81. But this consequence after you have sufficiently slighted and disgraced it, at length you promise *us news, and pretend to grant it.* But what is that which you mean to grant? That the Apostles did put no Article in their Creed but only that of the Church? Or that, if they had done so, they had done better than now they have done? This is D. *Potter*'s inference out of your Doctrin: and truly, if you should grant this, this were news indeed? *Yes*, say you, *I will grant it, but only thus far, that Christ hath referred us only to his Church.* Yea, but this is clean another thing, and no news at all, that you should grant that, which you would fain have granted to you. So that your dealing with us is just as if a man should proffer me a courtesie, and pretend that he would oblige himself by a note under his hand, to give me twenty pound; and instead of it write, that I owe him forty, and desire me to subsctibe to it and be thankful. Of such favours as these it is very safe to be liberal.

82. You tell us afterward (but how it comes in I know not) that *it were a childish argument, The Creed contains not all things necessary*; Ergo, *It is not profitable!* Or, *The Church alone is sufficient to teach us by some convenient means*: Ergo, *She must teach us without means.* These indeed are childish arguments; but, for ought I see, you alone are the father of them: for, in D. *Potter*'s book, I can neither meet with them, nor any like them. He indeed tels you, that if (by an impossible supposition) your Doctrin were

true,

true, another and a far ſhorter Creed would have been more expedient: even this alone, *I believe the* Roman *Church to be infallible.* But why you ſhould conclude, he makes this Creed which we have, unprofitable; becauſe he ſays another that might be conceived upon this falſe ſuppoſition, would be more profitable: or, that he lays a neceſſity upon the Church, of teaching without means: or, of not teaching this very Creed which now is taught; theſe things are ſo ſubtil that I cannot apprehend them. To my underſtanding, by thoſe words, *And ſent us to the Church for all the reſt*, he does rather manifeſtly imply, that the reſt might be very well, not only profitable but neceſſary, and that the Church was to teach this by Creeds, or Catechiſms, or Councels, or any other means which ſhe ſhould make choice of; for, being Infallible, ſhe could not chuſe amiſs.

83. Whereas therefore you ſay, *If the Apoſtles had expreſt no Article but that of the Catholique Church, ſhe muſt have taught us the other Articles in particular by Creeds, or other means:* This is very true, but no way repugnant to the truth of this which follows, that the Apoſtles (if your doctrin be true) had done better ſervice to the Church, though they had never made this Creed of theirs which now we have, if, in ſtead thereof, they had commanded in plain terms that for mens perpetual direction in the Faith, this ſhort Creed ſhould be taught all men, *I believe the* Roman *Church ſhall be for ever infallible.* Yet you muſt not ſo miſtake me, as if I meant, that they had done better, not to have taught the Church the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion; For then the Church not having learnt it of them, could not have taught it us, This therefore I do not ſay: but, ſuppoſing they had written theſe Scriptures as they have written, wherein all the Articles of their Creed are plainly delivered, and preached that Doctrin which they did preach, and done all other things as they have done, beſides the compoſing their Symbol: I ſay, if your doctrin were true, they had done a work infinitely more beneficial to the Church of Chriſt, if they had never compoſed their Symbol, which is but an imperfect comprehenſion of the neceſſary Points of ſimple Belief, and no diſtinctive mark, (as a Symbol ſhould be) between thoſe that are good Chriſtians, and thoſe that are not ſo; But inſtead thereof, had delivered this one Propoſition, which would have been certainly effectual for all the aforeſaid good intents and purpoſes, *The* Roman *Church ſhall be for ever infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes as matters of Faith.*

84. Whereas you ſay, *If we will believe we have all in the Creed when we have not all, it is not the Apoſtles fault but our own:* I tell you plainly, if it be a fault, I know not whoſe it ſhould be but theirs. For ſure it can be no fault in me to follow ſuch Guides whitherſoever they lead me; Now, I ſay, they have led me into this perſwaſion, becauſe they have given me great reaſon to believe it, and none to the contrary. The reaſon they have given me to believe it, is, becauſe it is apparent and confeſt, they did propoſe to themſelves in compoſing it, ſome good end or ends: As *that Chriſtians might have a form, by which* (for matter of Faith) *they might profeſs themſelves Catholiques.* So *Putean* out of *Tho. Aquinas*: *That the faithful might know, what the Chriſtian people is to believe explicitly.* So *Vincent Filiucius*: *That being ſeparated into divers parts of the World, they might preach the ſame thing:* And, *that, that might ſerve as a mark to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from Infidels*, So Card. *Richlieu.* Now for all theſe & for any other good

intent, I ſay, it will be plainly uneffectual, unleſs it contain at leaſt all Points of ſimple Belief, which are, in ordinary courſe, neceſſary to be explicitly known by all men. So that, if it be a fault in me to believe this, it muſt be my fault to believe the Apoſtles, wiſe and good men: which I cannot do if I believe not this. And therefore, what *Richardus de ſancto Victore* ſays of God himſelf, I make no ſcruple at all to apply to the Apoſtles, and to ſay, *Si error eſt quod credo, à vobis deceptus ſum*: If it be an error which I believe, it is you, and my reverend eſteem of you and your actions, that hath led me into it. For as for your ſuſpition, *That we are led into this perſwaſion, out of a hope that we may the better maintain by it ſome opinions of our own*, It is plainly uncharitable. I know no opinion I have, which I would not as willingly forſake as keep, if I could ſee ſufficient reaſon to enduce me to believe, that it is the will of God I ſhould forſake it. Neither do I know any opinion I hold againſt the Church of *Rome*, but I have more evident grounds then this whereupon to build it. For let but theſe Truths be granted: That the authority of the Scripture is independent on your Church, and dependent only in reſpect of us upon univerſal Tradition; That Scripture is the only Rule of Faith: That all things neceſſary to Salvation are plainly delivered in Scripture: Let, I ſay, theſe moſt certain and Divine Truths be laid for Foundations, and let our ſuperſtructions be conſequent and coherent to them; and, I am confident, Peace would be reſtored, and Truth maintained againſt you, though the Apoſtles Creed were not in the World.

CHAP. V.

That Luther, Calvin, *their Aſſociates, and all who began or continue the Separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formal ſin of Schiſm.*

THE Searcher of all Hearts is witneſs with how unwilling minds, we Catholiques are drawn to faſten the denomination of Schiſmatiques, or Heretiques, on them, for whoſe ſouls, if they employed their beſt blood, they judge that it could not be better ſpent! If we rejoyce, that they are contriſtated at ſuch titles, our joy riſeth not from their trouble or grief, but, as that of the Apoſtles did, from the fountain of Charity, *becauſe they are contriſtated to repentance*; that ſo, after unpartial examination, they finding themſelves to be what we ſay, may, by God's holy grace, begin to diſlike, what themſelves are. For our part, we muſt remember that our obligation is, to keep within the mean, betwixt uncharitable bitterneſs, and pernitious flattery, not yielding to worldly reſpects, nor offending Chriſtian Modeſty, but uttering the ſubſtance of truth in ſo *Charitable* manner, that not ſo much we, as Truth, and Charity, may ſeem to ſpeak; according to the wholeſome advice of S. *Gregory Nazianzen* in theſe divine words: *We do not affect peace with* (a) *prejudice of the true doctrine, that ſo we may get a name of being gentle, and mild, and yet we ſeek to conſerve peace, fighting in a lawful manner, and containing our ſelves within our compaſs, and the rule of Spirit. And of theſe things my judgment is, and, for my part, I preſcribe the ſame law to all that deal with ſouls, and treat of true Doctrine, that neither they exaſperate mens minds by harſhneſs, nor make them haughty or inſolent, by ſubmiſſion; but that, in the cauſe of Faith they behave themſelves prudently, and adviſedly, and do not in either of theſe things exceed the mean.* With whom agreeth S. *Leo*, ſaying: *It behoveth us in ſuch cauſes to be* (b) *moſt careful, that without noiſe of contentions, both Charity be conſerved, and Truth maintained.*

(a) *Orat.* 32.

(b) *Epiſt.* 8.

2. For better method, we will handle theſe Points in order. Firſt, we will ſet down the nature, and eſſence, of, as I may call it, the *Quality* of *Schiſm*. In the ſecond place, the greatneſs, and grievouſneſs, or (ſo to term it) the *Quantity* thereof. For the Nature, or Quality, will tell us who may without injury be judged Schiſmatiques: and by the greatneſs, or quantity, ſuch as find themſelves guilty thereof, will remain acquainted with the true ſtate of their ſoul, and whether they may conceive any hope of Salvation or no. And becauſe Schiſm will be found to be a diviſion from the Church, which could not happen, unleſs there were always a viſible Church; we will, Thirdly, prove or rather take it as a Point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all Ages, There hath been ſuch a Viſible Congregation of Faithful People. Fourthly, we will demonſtrate, that *Luther, Calvin,* and

and the reſt, did ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of that always viſible Church of Chriſt, and therefore were guilty of *Schiſm*. And fifthly, we will make it evident, that the viſible true Church of Chriſt, out of which *Luther* and his followers departed, was no other but the *Roman Church*; and conſequently, that both they, and all others who perſiſt in the ſame diviſions, are Schiſmatiques by reaſon of their ſeparation from the Church of *Rome*.

3. For the firſt Point touching the *Nature*, or *Quality* of Schiſm: As the natural perfection of man conſiſts in his being the *Image* of God his Creator, by the powers of his ſoul; ſo his ſupernatural perfection is placed in *ſimilitude* with God, as his laſt End and Felicity; and, by having the ſaid ſpiritual faculties, his *Underſtanding* and *Will* is linked to him. His Underſtanding is united to God by *Faith*, his Will, by *Charity*. The former relies upon his infallible *Truth*: The latter carrieth us to his infinite *Goodneſs*. *Faith* hath a deadly oppoſite, *Hereſie*. Contrary to the Union, or Unity of *Charity*, is Separation and *Diviſion*. Charity is twofold. As it reſpects God, his Oppoſite Vice is *Hatred* againſt God: as it uniteth us to our *Neighbour*, his contrary is *Separation* or diviſion of affections and will, from our *Neighbour*. Our Neighbour may be conſidered, either as one private perſon hath a ſingle relation to another, or as all concur to make one Company or Congregation, which we call the Church; and this is the moſt principal reference and Union of one man with another: becauſe the chiefeſt Unity is that of the *Whole*, to which the particular Unity of *Parts* is ſubordinate. This Unity, or Oneneſs, (if ſo I may call it) is effected by Charity, uniting all the members of the Church in one *Myſtical Body*; contrary to which, is *Schiſm*, from the Greek word ſignifying *Sciſſure*, or *Diviſion*. Wherefore upon the whole matter, we find that *Schiſm*, as the Angelical Doctor, S. *Thomas*, defines it, is; *A voluntary ſeparation* (c) *from the Unity of that Charity, whereby all the members of the Church are united*. From hence he deduceth, that *Schiſm* is a ſpecial and particular vice, diſtinct from *Hereſie*, becauſe they are oppoſite to two different Vertues: Hereſie, to Faith: Schiſm to Charity. To which purpoſe he fitly alledgeth S. *Hierom* upon theſe words, (*Tit.* 3.) *A man that is an Heretique after the firſt and ſecond admonition avoid*, ſaying: *I conceive that there is this difference betwixt Schiſm and Hereſie, that Hereſie involves ſome perverſe aſſertion: Schiſm for Epiſcopal diſſention doth ſeparate men from the Church*. The ſame Doctrine is delivered by S. *Auſtin* in theſe words: *Heretiques* (d) *and Schiſmatiques call their Congregations, Churches: but Heretiques corrupt the Faith by believing of God falſe things: but Schiſmatiques by wicked diviſions break from fraternal Charity, although they believe what we believe. Therefore the Heretique belongs not to the Church, becauſe ſhe loves God: nor the Schiſmatique, becauſe ſhe loves her Neighbour*. And in another place he ſaith: *It is wont to be demanded* (e) *how Schiſmatiques, be diſtinguiſhed from Heretiques: and this difference is found, that not a diverſe Faith, but the divided ſociety of Communion doth make Schiſmatiques*. It is then evident that Schiſm is different from Hereſie. Nevertheleſs (ſaith S. *Thomas*) (f) As he who is deprived of Faith muſt needs want Charity: ſo every Heretique is a Schiſmatique, but not converſively every Schiſmatique is an Heretique; though becauſe want of Charity diſpoſes and makes way to the deſtruction of Faith (according to thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *which* [a good conſcience] *ſome caſting off, have ſuffered ſhipwrack in their Faith*) Schiſm ſpeedily degenerates to Hereſie, as S. *Hierom* after the rehearſed words teacheth, ſaying: *Though Schiſm in the beginning may in ſome ſort be underſtood different from Hereſie; yet there is no Schiſm which doth not faign ſome Hereſie to it ſelf, that ſo it may ſeem to have departed from the Church upon good reaſon*. Nevertheleſs when Schiſm proceeds originally from Hereſie, Hereſie as being in that caſe the predominant quality in theſe two peccant humours, giveth the denomination of an *Heretique*; as on the other ſide we are wont, eſpecially in the beginning, or for a while, to call *Schiſmatiques*, thoſe men who firſt began with only *Schiſm*, though in proceſs of time they fell into ſome *Hereſie*, and by that means are indeed both Schiſmatiques and Heretiques.

1. Point. The nature of Schiſm.

(c) 2.2.q.39. art.in corp. & ad 3.

(d) *Lib. de Fid. & Symbol. cap.* 10.

(e) *Qu. Evang. ex Mat. q.* 11.

(f) *ubi ſupra.*

4. The reaſon why both Hereſie and Schiſm are repugnant to the being of a good *Catholique*, is: Becauſe the *Catholique*, or Univerſal Church ſignifies *One* Congregation, or Company of faithful people, and therefore implies not only *Faith*, to make them *Faithful* believers, but alſo *Communion*, or *common union*, to make them *One* in Charity, which excludes Separation, and *Diviſion*: and therefore in the Apoſtles Creed, *Communion of Saints*, is immediatly joyned to the *Catholique Church*.

5. From this definition of Schiſm may be inferred, that the guilt thereof is contracted, not only by diviſion from the Univerſal Church; but alſo, by a Separation from a particular Church or Dioceſs which agrees with the Univerſal. In this manner *Meletius* was a Schiſmatique, but not an Heretique, becauſe, as we read in S. *Epiphanius* (h) he was *of the right Faith: for his Faith was not altered at any time from the holy Catholique Church*, &c. *He made a Sect, but departed not from Faith*. Yet becauſe he made to himſelf a particular Congregation againſt S. *Peter* Archbiſhop of *Alexandria* his lawful Superiour, and by that means brought in a diviſion in that particular Church, he was a Schiſmatique. And it is well worth the noting, that the *Meletians* building new Churches, put this Title upon them, *The Church of Martyrs*: and upon the ancient Churches of thoſe who ſucceeded *Peter*, was inſcribed, *The Catholique Church*. For ſo it is. A new Sect muſt have a new name, which though it be never ſo gay and ſpecious, as *the Church of Martyrs: the Reformed Church*, &c. yet the Novelty ſheweth that it is not the Catholique, not a true Church. And, that Schiſm may be committed by diviſion from a particular Church, we read in *Optatus Milevitanus* (i) theſe remarkable words, (which do well declare who be Schiſmatiques) brought by him to prove that not *Cæcilianus* but *Parmenianus* was a Schiſmatique: For Cæcilianus *went not out from* Majorinus *thy Grand-Father* (he means his next predeceſſour, but one, in the Biſhoprick,) *but* Majorinus *from* Cæcilianus: *neither did* Cæcilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or of* Cyprian (who was but a particular Biſhop,) *but* Majorinus, *in whoſe Chair thou ſitteſt, which had no beginning before* Majorinus *himſelf*. *Seeing it is manifeſtly known that theſe things were ſo done, it evidently appeareth, that you are heirs both of Traditors* (that is, of thoſe who delivered up the holy Bible to be burned) *and of Schiſmatiques*. And it ſeemeth that this kind of Schiſm muſt principally be admitted by Proteſtants, who acknowledge no one viſible Head of the whole Church, but hold

(h) *Hæreſ.* 68.

(i) *Lib.* 1. *cont. Parmen.*

that every particular Dioceſs, Church, or Countrey is governed by it ſelf independently of any one Perſon, or General Councel, to which all Chriſtians have obligation to ſubmit their judgments, and wills.

2. Point. The grievouſneſs of Schiſm.

6. As for the grievouſneſs or quantity of Schiſm (which was the ſecond Point propoſed) S. *Thomas* teacheth, that amongſt ſins againſt our Neighbour, *Schiſm* (l) is the moſt grievous; becauſe it is againſt the ſpiritual good of the *multitude, or Community*. And therefore as in a *Kingdom or Commonwealth*, there is as great difference between the crime of rebellion or ſedition, and debates among private men, as there is inequality betwixt one man, and a whole kingdom; ſo in the Church, *Schiſm* is as much more grievous than *Sedition* in a *Kingdom*, as the ſpiritual good of ſouls ſurpaſſeth the civil and political weal. And S. *Thomas* adds further, and they loſe the ſpiritual *Power* of *Juriſdiction*; and if they go about to abſolve from ſin, or to excommunicate, their actions are invalid; which he proves out of the Canon *Novitianus. Cauſa 7 quæſt.* 1. which ſaith: *He that keepeth neither the unity of Spirit, nor the vinculum of agreement, and ſeparates himſelf from the band of the Church, and the Colledge of Prieſts, can neither have the Power, nor dignity of a Biſhop.* The *Power* alſo of *Order* (for example, to conſecrate the Euchariſt, to ordain Prieſts, *&c.*) they cannot lawfully exerciſe.

(l) *Supra art.* 2. ad 3.

(m) *Hom.* 11. *in ep. ad Eph.*

7. In the judgment of the holy Fathers, Schiſm is a moſt grievous offence. S. *Chryſoſtom* (m) compares theſe Schiſmatical dividers of Chriſt's *myſtical* body, to thoſe who ſacrilegiouſly pierced his *natural* body, ſaying: *Nothing doth ſo much incenſe God, as that the Church ſhould be divided. Although we ſhould do innumerable good works, if we divide the full Eccleſiaſtical Congregation, we ſhall be puniſhed no leſs than they who tore his* (natural) *body. For that was done to the gain of the whole world, although not with that intention: but this hath no profit at all, but there ariſeth from it moſt great harm. Theſe things are ſpoken, not only to thoſe who bear office, but alſo to thoſe who are governed by them.* Behold how neither a moral good life (which conceit deceiveth many) nor authority of Magiſtrates, nor any neceſſity of Obeying Superiours can excuſe Schiſm from being a moſt hainous offence. *Optatus Mileuitanus* (o) calls Schiſm, *Ingens flagitium, a huge crime.* And ſpeaking to the *Donatiſts*, ſaith, *that Schiſm is evil in the higheſt degree, even you are not able to deny.* No leſs pathetical is S. *Auguſtine* upon this ſubject. He reckons Schiſmatiques amongſt Pagans, Heretiques, and Jews, ſaying: *Religion is to be ſought, neither in the confuſion of Pagans, nor* (p) *in the filth of Heretiques, nor in the languiſhing of Schiſmatiques, nor in the Age of the Jews; but amongſt thoſe alone who are called Chriſtian Catholiques, or Orthodox, that is, lovers of unity in the whole body, and followers of truth.* Nay, he eſteems them worſe than Infidels and Idolaters, ſaying: *Thoſe whom the Donatiſts* (q) *heal from the wound of Infidelity and Idolatry, they hurt more grievouſly with the wound of Schiſm.* Let here thoſe men who are pleaſed untruly to call us Idolaters, reflect upon themſelves, and conſider, that this holy Father judgeth Schiſmatiques (as they are) to be worſe than Idolaters, which they abſurdly call us. And this he proveth by the example of *Core, Dathan,* and *Abiram*, and other rebellious Schiſmatiques of the old Teſtament, who were conveyed alive down into Hell, and puniſhed more openly than Idolaters. *No doubt* (ſaith this holy Father) *but* (r) *that was committed moſt wickedly, which was puniſhed moſt ſeverely.* In another place he yoketh Schiſm with Hereſie, ſaying upon the Eighth Beatitude: *Many* (s) *Heretiques, under the name of Chriſtians, deceiving mens ſouls,* do ſuffer many ſuch things; but therefore they are excluded from this reward, becauſe it is not only ſaid, Happy are they who ſuffer perſecution, but there is added, for Juſtice. But where there is not ſound Faith, there cannot be juſtice. Neither can Schiſmatiques promiſe to themſelves any part of this reward, becauſe likewiſe where there is no Charity, there cannot be Juſtice. And in another place, yet more effectually he ſaith: *Being out of* (t) *the Church, and divided from the heap of unity, and the bond of Charity, thou ſhouldſt be puniſhed with eternal death, though thou ſhouldeſt be burned alive for the name of Chriſt.* And in another place, he hath theſe words: *If he hear not the Church, let him be to* (u) *thee, as an Heathen or Publican; which is more grievous than if he were ſmitten with the ſword, conſumed with flames, or caſt to wilde beaſts.* And elſewhere: *Out of the Catholique Church* (ſaith he) *one* (w) *may have Faith, Sacraments, Orders, and in ſum all things except Salvation.* With S. *Auguſtine*, his Countryman and ſecond ſelf in ſympathy of ſpirit, S. *Fulgentius* agreeth, ſaying: *Believe this* (x) *ſtedfaſtly without doubting, that every Heretique or Schiſmatique, baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, if before the end of his life he be not reconciled to the Catholique Church, what Alms ſoever he give, yea though he ſhould ſhed his blood for the name of Chriſt, he cannot obtain Salvation.* Mark again, how no moral honeſty of life, no good deeds, no Martyrdom, can without repentance avail any Schiſmatique for Salvation. Let us alſo add that D. *Potter* ſaith: Schiſm is no leſs (y) damnable than Hereſie.

(o) *Lib. cont. Parmen.*

(p) *Lib. de vera Relig. cap. 6.*

(q) *Cont. Donatiſt. l. 1. cap. 8.*

(r) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 6.*

(s) *De ſerm. Dom. in monte, cap. 5.*

(t) *Epiſt.* 204.

(u) *Cont. adverſ. Leg. & Prophet. l. 2. cap.* 37.

(w) *De geſt. cum Emerit.*

(x) *De fide ad Pet.*

(y) Pag. 42.

8. But O you Holy, Learned, zealous Fathers, and Doctors of Gods Church; out of theſe premiſes, of the grievouſneſs of Schiſm, and of the certain damnation which it bringeth (if unrepented) what concluſion draw you for the inſtruction of Chriſtians? S. *Auguſtine* maketh this wholeſome inference. *There is* (z) *no juſt neceſſity to divide unity.* S. *Irenæus* concludeth: *They cannot* (a) *make any ſo important reformation, as the evil of the Schiſm is pernitious.* S. *Denis of Alexandria* ſaith: *Certainly,* (b) *all things ſhould rather be endured, than to conſent to the diviſion of the Church of God: theſe Martyrs being no leſs glorious, that expoſe themſelves to hinder the diſmembring of the Church, than thoſe that ſuffer rather than they will offer ſacrifice to Idols.* Would to God all thoſe who divided themſelves from that viſible Church of Chriſt, which was upon earth when *Luther* appeared, would rightly conſider of theſe things! And thus much of the ſecond Point.

(z) *Cont. Parm. l. 2. cap.* 62.

(a) *Cont. hæreſ. l. 4. cap.* 62.

(b) *Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 6.*

3. Point. Perpetual Viſibility of the Church.

9. We have juſt and neceſſary occaſion, eternally to bleſs Almighty God, who hath vouchſafed to make us members of the Catholique *Roman* Church, from which while men fall, they precipitate themſelves into ſo vaſt abſurdities, or rather ſacrilegious blaſphemies, as is implyed in the Doctrin of the total deficiency of the viſible Church, which yet is maintained by divers chief Proteſtants, as may at large be ſeen in *Breerely*, and others; out of whom I will here name *Jewel*, ſaying: *The truth was unknown* (c) *at that time, and unheard of, when* Martin Luther, *and* Ulderick Zwinglius

(c) *Apol. part.* 4. *c.* 4. *diviſ.* 2.

firſt

first came into the knowledge and preaching of the Gospel. Perkins saith: *We say, that* (d) *before the dayes of* Luther *for the space of many hundred years, an universal Apostacy overspread the whole face of the earth, and that our* (Protestant) *Church was not then visible to the world.* Napper upon the *Revelations* teacheth, *that from the year of* (e) *Christ three hundred and sixteen, the Antichristian and Papistical raign hath begun, raigning universally, and without any debatable contradiction, one thousand two hundred sixty years,* (that is, till *Luther's* time:) And that, *from the year of* (f) *Christ three hundred and sixteen, God hath withdrawn his Visible Church from open Assemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men, &c. during the space of one thousand two hundred threescore years.* And that, *the* (g) *Pope and Clergy have possessed the outward Visible Church of Christians, even one thousand two hundred threescore years.* And that, *the* (h) *true Church abode latent, and invisible.* And Brocard (i) upon the *Revelations*, professeth to joyn in opinion with *Napper*. *Fulk* affirmeth, *that in the* (k) *time of* Boniface *the third*, which was the year six hundred and seven, *the Church was invisible, and fled into the wilderness, there to remain a long season.* *Luther* saith: *Primò solus eram: At the first* (l) *I was alone.* *Jacob Hailbronerus* one of the Disputants for the Protestant Party, in the conference at *Ratisbon*, affirmeth (m) that the true Church was interrupted by Apostasie from the true Faith. *Calvin* saith: *It is absurd in the very* (n) *beginning to break one from another, after we have been forced to make a separation from the whole world.* It were over-long to alledge the words of *Joannes Regius*, *Daniel Chamierus*, *Beza*, *Oebimus*, *Castalio*, and others to the same purpose.

And in his defence printed Ann 1571. Pag. 426.

(d) In his Exposition upon the Creed, Pag. 400.

(e) *Propos.* 37. Pag 68.

(f) *Ibid. cap.* 12. Pag. 161. *col.* 3.

(g) *Ibid. in cap.* 11. Pag. 145.

(h) *Ibid.* Pag. 191.

(i) *Fol.* 110. & 123.

The reason which cast them upon this wicked Doctrin, was a desperate voluntary necessity: because they being resolved not to acknowledge the *Roman* Church to be Christ's true Church, and yet being convinced by all manner of evidence, that for divers Ages before *Luther* there was no other Congregation of Christians, which could be the Church of Christ; there was no remedy but to affirm, that upon earth Christ had no visible Church: which they would never have avouched, if they had known how to avoid the foresaid inconvenience (as they apprehended it) of submitting themselves to the *Roman* Church.

(k) Answer to a counterfeit Catholique. Pag. 16.

(l) *In præfat. operum suorum.*

(m) *In suo Acatholico. vol. a. 1 c. cap. 9. p. 479*

10. Against these exterminating spirits, D. *Potter*, and other more moderate Protestants, professe, that Christ always had, and always will have, upon earth a Visible Church: otherwise (saith he) *our Lord's* (o) *promise of her stable* (p) *edification should be of no value.* And in another place, having affirmed that Protestants have not left the Church of *Rome*, but her corruptions, and acknowledging her still to be a member of Christ's body, he seeketh to clear himself and others from *Schism*, because (saith he) *the property* (q) *of Schism is* (witness the Donatists *and* Luciferians) *to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates. And, if any Zelots amongst us have proceeded to heavier censures, their zeal may be excused, but their charity and wisdom cannot be justified.* And elsewhere he acknowledgeth, that the *Roman* Church hath *those main and* (r) *essential truths, which give her the name and essence of a Church.*

(n) *Epist.* 141.

(o) Pag. 154.

(p) Mat. 16. 18.

(q) Pag. 76.

(r) Pag. 83.

11. It being therefore granted by D. *Potter*, and the chiefest and best learned English Protestants, that Christ's Visible Church cannot perish, it will be needless for me in this occasion to prove it. S. *Augustine* doubted not to say: *The Prophets* (s) *spoke more obscurely of Christ, then of the Church: because, as I think, they did forsee in spirit, that men were to make parties against the Church, and that they were not to have so great strife concerning Christ: therefore that was more plainly foretold, and more openly professed, about which greater contentions were to rise, that it might turn to the condemnation of them who have seen it, and yet gone forth.* And in another place he saith: *How do we conside* (t) *to have received manifestly Christ himself from holy Scriptures, if we have not also manifestly received the Church from them?* And indeed to what Congregation shall a man have recourse for the affairs of his soul, if upon earth there be no Visible Church of Christ? Beside, to imagine a company of men believing one thing in their heart, and with their mouth professing the contrary, (as they must be supposed to do; for, if they had professed what they believed, they would have become Visible) is to dream of a damned crew of dissembling Sycophants, but not to conceive a right notion of the Church of Christ our Lord. And therefore S. *Augustine* saith: *We cannot be saved, unless labouring also for the* (u) *Salvation of others, we profess with our mouths, the same Faith which we bear in our hearts.* And if any man hold it lawful to dissemble, and deny matters of Faith, we cannot be assured, but that they actually dissemble, and hide Anabaptism, Arianism, yea Turcism, and even Atheism, or any other false belief, under the outward profession of Calvinism. Do not Protestants teach that preaching of the Word, and administration of Sacraments (which cannot but make a Church Visible) are inseparable notes of the true Church? And therefore they must either grant a Visible Church, or none at all. No wonder then, if S. *Austin* account this Heresie so gross, that he saith against those who in his time defended the like error: *But this Church which* (w) *hath been of all Nations is no more, she hath perished*; *so say they that are in not in her. O impudent speech!* And afterward; *This voice so abominable, so detestable, so full of presumption and falshood, which is sustained with no truth, inlightned with no wisdom, seasoned with no salt, vain, rash, heady, pernitious, the holy Ghost foresaw, &c.* And *peradventure some* (x) *one may say, there are other sheep I know not where, with which I am not acquainted, yet God hath care of them. But he is too absurd in humane sense, that can imagine such things.* And these men do not consider, that while then deny the perpetuity of a Visible Church, they destroy their own present Church, according to the argument, which S. *Augustine* urged against the *Donatists* in these words (y) *If the Church were lost in Cyprian's* (we may say in *Gregory's*,) *time, from whence did* Donatus (Luther) *appear? From what earth did he spring? From what sea is he come? From what heaven did he drop?* And in another place: *How can they vaunt* (z) *to have any Church, if he have ceased ever since those times?* And all Divines by defining *Schism* to be a division from the true Church, suppose that there must be a known Church, from which it is possible for men to depart. But enough of this in these few words.

(s) *In Psal.* 30. *Com.* 2.

(t) *Epist.* 48.

(u) *S. Aug. de Fide & Symbol. c.* 1.

(w) *In Psal.* 101.

(x) *De ovib. c.* 1.

(y) *De Bapt. cont. Donat.*

(z) *Lib.* 3. *cont. Parm.*

12. Let

4. Point. *Luther* and all that follow him are Schismatiques.

12. Let us now come to the fourth, and chief Point, which was, to examine whether *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the rest, did not depart from the external Communion of Christ's Visible Church, and by that separation became guilty of Schism. And that they are properly Schismatiques clearly followeth from the grounds which we have laid, concerning the nature of Schism, which consists in leaving the external Communion of the Visible Church of Christ our Lord: and it is clear by evidence of fact, that *Luther* and his followers forsook the Communion of that Ancient Church.

For they did not so much as pretend to joyn with any Congregation, which had a being before their time; for they would needs conceive that no Visible Company was free from errors in Doctrin, and corruption in practice: And therefore they opposed the Doctrin; they withdrew their obedience from the Prelates; they left participation in Sacraments; they changed the Liturgy of publique Service of whatsoever Church then extant. And these things they pretended to do out of a perswasion, that they were bound (forsooth) in conscience so to do, unless they would participate with errors, corruptions, and superstitions. *We dare not* (saith D. *Potter*) *communicate* (a) *with* Rome, *either in her publique Liturgy, which is manifestly polluted with gross superstition*, &c. *or in those corrupt and ungrounded opinions, which she hath added to the Faith of Catholiques*. But now let D. *Potter* tell me with what visible Church extant before *Luther*, he would have adventured to communicate in her publique *Liturgy* and *Doctrin*, since he durst not communicate with *Rome*? He will not be able to assign any, even with any little colour of common sense. If then they departed from all visible Communities professing Christ, it followeth that they also left the Communion of the true visible Church, which soever it was, whether that of *Rome*, or any other; of which Point I do not for the present dispute. Yea this the *Lutherans* do not only acknowledge, but prove, and brag of. If (saith a learned *Lutheran*) *there had been right* (b) *Believers which went before* Luther *in his office, there had then been no need of a* Lutheran *Reformation*. Another affirmeth it to be *ridiculous*, to think that *in the time* (c) *before* Luther, *any had the purity of Doctrin*; *and that* Luther *should receive it from them, and not they from* Luther. Another speaketh roundly, and saith, It is *impudency* to say, that *many learned men* (d) *in* Germany *before* Luther, *did hold the Doctrin of the Gospel*. And I add: That far *greater impudency*, it were to affirm, that *Germany* did not agree with the rest of *Europe*, and other Christian Catholique Nations, and consequently, that it is the greatest *impudency* to deny, that he departed from the Communion of the visible Catholique Church, spread over the whole world. We have heard *Calvin* saying of Protestants in general; *We were*, even, *forced* (e) *to make a separation from the whole world*. And, *Luther* of himself in particular: *In the beginning* (f) *I was alone*. *Ergo* (say I, by your good leave) you were at least a *Schismatique*, divided from the Ancient Church, and a member of no new Church. For no sole man can constitute a Church; and though he could, yet such a Church could not be that glorious Company, of whose number, greatness, and amplitude so much hath been spoken, both in the old Testament, and in the New.

(a) *Pag.* 68.

(b) *Georgius Mulius in Aug. Confess. art.* 7. *de Eccles. Pag.* 137

(c) *Bened. Morgenstern. tract. de Eccles. Pag.* 145.

(d) *Conrad. Schlusselb in Theol. Calvin. lib.* 2. *fol.* 130.

(e) *Epist.* 141.

(f) *In præfat. operum suorum.*

13. D. *Potter* endeavours to avoid this evident Argument by divers evasions; but by the confutation thereof I will (with God's holy assistance) take occasion, even out of his own Answers and grounds, to bring unanswerable reasons to convince them of *Schism*.

14. His chief Answer is: That they have not left the Church, but her *corruption*.

15. I reply. This answer may be given either by those furious people, who teach that those abuses, and corruptions in the Church were so enormous, that they could not stand with the nature, or being of a true Church of Christ: Or else by those other more calm Protestants, who affirm, that those errors did not destroy the *being*, but only deform the *beauty* of the Church. Against both these sorts of men, I may fitly use that unanswerable Dilemma, which S. *Augustine* brings against the *Donatists* in these concluding words: *Tell me whether the* (g) *Church at that time when you say she entertained those who were guilty of all crimes, by the contagion of those sinful persons, perished, or perished not? Answer; Whether the Church perished, or perished not? Make choice of what you think. If then she perished, What Church brought forth* Donatus? (we may say *Luther*.) *But if she could not perish, because so many were incorporated into her, without Baptism*, (that is, *without* a second baptism, or rebaptization, and I may say, without *Luther*'s Reformation) *answer me I pray you, What madness did move the Sect of* Donatus *to separate themselves from her upon pretence to avoid the communion of bad men!* I beseech the Reader to ponder every one of S. *Augustine*'s words; and to consider, whether any thing could have been spoken more directly against *Luther*, and his followers of what sort soever.

(g) *Lib.* 2 *cont. Epist. Gaudent. cap.* 7.

16. And now to answer more in particular; I say to those who teach that the visible Church of Christ perished for many Ages, that I can easily afford them the courtesie, to free them from meer *Schism*: but all men touched with any spark of zeal to vindicate the wisdom and goodness of our Saviour from blasphemous injury, cannot chuse but believe and proclaim them to be superlative Arch-heretiques. Nevertheless, if they will needs have the honour of Singularity, and desire to be both *formal Heretiques*, and *properly Schismatiques*, I will tell them, that while they dream of an invisible Church of men, which agreed with them in Faith, they will upon due reflection find themselves to be Schismatiques, from those corporeal Angels, or invisible men, because *they* held external Communion with the visible Church of those times, the outward Communion of which visible Church *these* modern hot-spurs forsaking, were thereby divided from the outward Communion of their hidden Brethren, and so are Separatists from the external *Communion* of them, with whom they agree in *Faith*; which is Schism in the most formal, and proper signification thereof. Moreover, according to D. *Potter*, those boisterous Creatures are properly Schismatiques. For, the reason why he thinks himself, and such as he is, to be cleared from Schism, notwithstanding their division from the *Roman* Church, is, because (according to his Divinity) the property of (h) *Schism, is*, (*witness the* Donatists *and* Luciferians) *to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates*: But those Protestants of whom we now spake, *cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation*, the Church from which they separated themselves; and they do it

(h) *Pag.* 76.

directly

directly as the Donatists (in whom you exemplifie) did, by affirming that the true Church had perished: and therefore they cannot be cleared from *Schism*, if you may be their Judge. Consider, I pray you, how many prime Protestants both domestical and forraign you have at one blow struck off from hope of Salvation, and condemned to the lowest pit for the grievous sin of *Schism*. And withall it imports you to consider, that you also involve your self, and other moderate Protestants in the self-same crime, and punishment, while you communicate with those, who according to your own principles, are properly, and formally *Schismatiques*. For, if you held your self obliged under pain of damnation to forsake the Communion of the *Roman* Church, by reason of her Errors and Corruptions, which yet you confess were *not Fundamental*; shall it not be much more damnable for you, to live in Communion and Confraternity, with those who defend an error of the failing of the Church; which in the *Donatists* you confess (i) to have been *properly heretical against the Article of our Creed, I believe the Church?* And I desire the Reader, here to apply an authority of S. *Cyprian* (*Epist. 76.*) which he shall find alledged in the next number. And this may suffice for confutation of the aforesaid Answer, as it might have relation to the rigid Calvinists. (i) Pag. 126.

17. For Confutation of those Protestants, who hold that the Church of Christ had always a being, and cannot err in Points Fundamental, and yet teach that she may err in matters of less moment, wherein, if they forsake her, they would be accounted not to leave the Church, but only her corruptions; I must say that they change the state of our present Question, not distinguishing between *internal* Faith, and *external Communion*, not between *Schism*, and *Heresie*. This I demonstrate out of D. *Potter* himself, who in expres words teacheth, that the promises which *our Lord hath made* (k) *unto his Church for his assistance, are intended not to any particular Persons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique: and they are to be extended not to every parcel, or particularity of truth, but only to Points of Faith, or Fundamental.* And afterwards speaking of the *Universal Church*, he saith: *It is comfort* (l) *enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will secure her from all capital dangers, and conserve her on earth against all enemies; but she may not hope to triumph over all sin and error, till she be in heaven.* Out of which words I observe, that, according to D. *Potter*, the self-same Church, which is the Universal Church, remaining the Universal true Church of Christ, may fall into errors and corruptions: from whence it clearly followeth, that it is impossible to leave the *External communion* of the Church so corrupted, and retain *external* communion with the Catholique Church; since the Church Catholique, and the Church so corrupted is the self-same one Church, or company of men. And the contrary imagination talks in a dream, as if the errors and infections of the Catholique Church were not inherent in her, but were separate from her, like to *Accidents* without any *Subject*, or rather indeed, as if they were not *Accidents*, but *Hypostases*, or *Persons*, subsisting by themselves; for men cannot be said to live, in, or out of, the Communion of any dead creature, but with persons, endued with life and reason; and much less can men be said to live in the Communion of Accidents, as errors and corruptions are: and therefore it is an absurd thing to affirm, that Protestants divided themselves from the corruptions of the Church, but not from the Church her self, seeing the corruptions of the Church were inherent in the Church. All this is made more clear, if we consider, that when *Luther* appeared, there were not two distinct visible true Catholique Churches, holding contrary Doctrines, and divided in external Communion; one of the which two Churches did *triumph over all error*, and corruption in Doctrine and practice; but the other was stained with both. For to faign this diversity of two Churches, cannot stand with record of histories, which are silent of any such matter. It is against D. *Potter*'s own grounds, that the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, which were not true, if you will imagine a certain visible Catholique Church free from error even in Points not Fundamental. It contradicteth the words in which he said, the Church may *not hope to triumph over all error, till she be in heaven.* It evacuateth the brag of Protestants, that *Luther* reformed the whole Church: and lastly, It maketh *Luther* a Schismatique, for leaving the Communion of all visible Churches, seeing (upon this supposition) there was a visible Church of Christ free from all corruption, which therefore could not be forsaken without just imputation of *Schism*. We must therefore truly affirm, that since there was but one visible Church of Christ, which was truly Catholique, and yet was (according to Protestants stained with corruption; when *Luther* left the external Communion of that corrupted Church, he could not remain in the Communion of the Catholique Church, no more than it is possible to keep company with D. *Christopher Potter*, and not keep company with the Provost of Queens Colledge in Oxford, if D. *Potter* and the Provost be one and the self-same man: For so one should be, and not be, with him at the same time. This very Argument, drawn from the Unity of God's Church, S. *Cyprian* urgeth to convince, that *Novatianus* was cut off from the Church, in these words: *The Church is* (m) *One, which being One cannot be both within and without. If she be with* Novatianus, *she was not with* Cornelius; *But if she were with* Cornelius, *who succeeded* Fabianus, *by lawful ordination,* Novatianus *is not in the Church.* I purposely here speak only of *external Communion* with the Catholique Church. For in this Point there is great difference between *internal acts* of our understanding, and will; and of *external deeds.* Our Understanding and Will, are faculties (as Philsophers speak) abstractive, and able to distinguish, and, as it were, to part things, though in themselves they be really conjoyned. But real external deeds do take things in gross as they find them, not separating things which in reality are joyned together. Thus, one man may consider and love a sinner as he is a man, friend, benefactor, or the like; and at the same time not consider him, nor love him as he is a sinner; because these are acts of our Understanding and Will, which may respect their objects under some one formality, or consideration, without reference to other things contained in the self-same objects. But if one should strike, or kill a sinful man, he will not be excused by alledging that he killed him, not as a man, but as a sinner; because the self-same person being a man, and the sinner, the *external* act of murder fell joyntly upon the man, and the sinner. And for the same reason one cannot avoid the company of a sinner, and at the same time be really present with that man who is a sinner, (k) Pag. 151. (l) Pag. 155. (m) *Epist. 76. ad* Mag.

ner. And this is our caſe: and in this our Adverſaries are egregiouſly, and many of them affectedly miſtaken. For one may in ſome Points believe as the Church believeth, and diſagree from her in other. One may love the truth which ſhe holds, and deteſt her (pretended) corruptions. But it is impoſſible that a man ſhould really ſeparate himſelf from her external Communion, as ſhe is corrupted, and be really within the ſame external Communion as ſhe is ſound; becauſe ſhe is the ſelf-ſame Church which is ſuppoſed to be ſound in ſome things, and to err in others. Now, our queſtion for the preſent doth concern only this Point of *external Communion*: becauſe *Schiſm*, as it is diſtinguiſhed from *Hereſie*, is committed when one divides himſelf from the *External Communion* of that Church with which he agrees in *Faith*; Whereas Hereſie doth neceſſarily imply a difference in matter of *Faith*, and belief: and therefore to ſay, that they left not the viſible Church; but her errors, can only excuſe them from *Hereſie* (which ſhall be tryed in the next Chapter) but not from *Schiſm*, as long as they are really divided from the *external Communion* of the ſelf-ſame viſible Church; which, notwithſtanding thoſe errors wherein they do in judgment diſſent from her, doth ſtill remain the true Catholique Church of Chriſt; and therefore while they forſake the corrupted Church, they forſake the Catholique Church. Thus then it remaineth clear, that their chiefeſt Anſwer changeth the very ſtate of the queſtion; confoundeth internal acts of the Underſtanding with the *external Deeds*; doth not diſtinguiſh between *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*; and leaves this demonſtrated againſt them, That they divided themſelves from the Communion of the viſible Catholique Church, becauſe they conceived that ſhe needed Reformation. But whether this pretence of Reformation will acquit them of *Schiſm*, I refer to the unpartial Judges heretofore (n) alleadged; as to *S. Irenæus*, who plainly ſaith: *They cannot make any ſo important* REFORMATION, *as the Evil of the Schiſm is pernitious.* To S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, ſaying: *Certainly all things ſhould be endured rather than to conſent to the diviſion of the Church of God: thoſe Martyrs being no leſs glorious that expoſe themſelves to hinder the diſmembring of the Church, then thoſe that ſuffer rather than they will offer ſacrifice to Idols.* To S. *Auguſtine*, who tels us: That not to hear the Church, *is a more grievous thing than if he were ſtricken with the ſword, conſumed with flames, expoſed to wild Beaſts.* And to conclude all in few words, he giveth this general preſcription: *There is no juſt neceſſity to divide unity*; And D. *Potter* may remember his own words: *There neither was* (s) *nor can be any juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt; no more than from Chriſt himſelf.* But I have ſhewed that *Luther*, and the reſt departed from the Church of Chriſt (if Chriſt had any Church upon earth:) Therefore there could be no juſt cauſe of *Reformation*, or what elſe ſoever) to do as they did; and therefore they muſt be contented to be held for *Schiſmatiques*.

(n) *Numb.* 8.

(s) *Pag.* 75.

18. Moreover, I demand whether thoſe corruptions which moved them to forſake the Communion of the Viſible Church, were in manners, or doctrin? Corruption in manners yields no ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church, otherwiſe men muſt go not only out of the Church, but out of the world, as the Apoſtle (t) ſaith. Our bleſſed Saviour foretold that there would be in the Church tares with choiſe Corn, and ſinners with juſt men. If then Proteſtants wax zealous, with the *Servants*, to pluck up the weeds, let them firſt hearken to the wiſdom of the *Maſter*: *Let both grow up.* And they ought to imitate them, who as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *Tolerate for the good of* (u) *unity, that which they deteſt for the good of equity.* And to whom the more frequent, and foul ſuch ſcandals are, by ſo much the more is the merit of their perſeverance in the Communion of the Church, and the Martyrdom of their patience, as the ſame Saint calls it. If they were offended with the life of ſome Eccleſiaſtical perſons, muſt they therefore deny obedience to their Paſtors, and finally break with Gods Church? The Paſtor of Paſtors teacheth us another leſſon. *upon the Chair of Moſes* (w) *have ſitten the Scribes and Phariſees. All things therefore whatſoever they ſhall ſay to you, obſerve yee, and do yee: but according to their works, do you not.* Muſt people except againſt laws, and revolt from Magiſtrates, becauſe ſome are negligent, or corrupt in the execution of the ſame laws, and performance of their office? If they intended reformation of manners, they uſed a ſtrange means for the atchieving of ſuch an end, by denying the neceſſity of Confeſſion, laughing at auſterity of pennance, condemning the Vows of Chaſtity, Poverty, Obedience, breaking Faſts, &c. And no leſs unfit were the *Men*, than the *Means*. I love not recrimination. But it is well known to how great crimes *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Zuinglius*, *Beza*, and others of the prime Reformers were notoriouſly obnoxious; as might be eaſily demonſtrated by the only tranſcribing of what others have delivered upon that ſubject: whereby it would appear, that they were very far from being any ſuch Apoſtolical men as God is wont to uſe in ſo great a work. And whereas they were wont, eſpecially in the beginning of their revoult, maliciouſly to exaggerate of the faults ſome Clergy men, *Eraſmus* ſaid well, (*Ep. ad Fratres inferioris Germaniæ,*) *Let the riot, luſt, ambition, avarice of Prieſts, and whatſoever other crimes be gathered together, Hereſie alone doth exceed all this filthy lake of vices.* Beſides nothing at all was omitted by the ſacred Council of *Trent*, which might tend to Reformation of manners. And finally, the vices of others are not hurtful to any but ſuch as imitate, and conſent to them; according to the ſaying of S. *Auguſtine*: *We conſerve* (y) *innocency, not by knowing the ill deeds of men, but by not yielding conſent to ſuch as we know, and by not judging raſhly of ſuch faults as we know not.* If you anſwer, that, not corruption in manners, but the approbation of them, doth yield ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church; I reply with S. *Auguſtine*, that the Church doth (as the pretended Reformers ought to have done) tolerate or bear with ſcandals and corruptions, but neither doth, nor can approve them. *The Church* (ſaith he) *being placed* (z) *betwixt much chaffe and cockle, doth bear with many things; but doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor act thoſe things which are againſt Faith, and good life.* But becauſe to approve corruption in manners as lawful, were an error againſt Faith, it belongs to corruption in Doctrin, which was the ſecond part of my demand.

(t) 1 Cor. 5. 10.

(u) *Ep.* 162.

(w) Mat. 33.

(y) *Ep.* 118.

(z) *Pag.* 75.

19. Now then, that corruptions in Doctrin (I ſtill ſpeak upon the untrue ſuppoſition of our Adverſaries) could not afford any ſufficient cauſe, or colourable neceſſity to depart from that Viſible Church, which was extant when *Luther* roſe, I demonſtrate out of D. *Potter*'s own confeſſion; that the Catholique Church neither hath, nor can err, in Points *Fundamental*, as we ſhewed out of his

his own expreſs words, which he alſo of ſet purpoſe delivereth in divers other places, and all they are obliged to maintain the ſame, who teach that Chriſt had alwayes a viſible Church upon earth: becauſe any one *Fundamental* error overthrows the *being* of a true Church. Now (as Schoolmen ſpeak) it is *implicatio in terminis* (a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroyeth the other, as if one ſhould ſay, A living dead man) to affirm, that the Church doth not err in Points neceſſary to Salvation, or damnably; and yet that it is damnable to remain in her Communion, becauſe ſhe teacheth errors which are confeſſed not to be damnable. For if the error be not damnable, nor againſt any Fundamental Article of Faith, the belief thereof cannot be damnable. But D. *Potter* teacheth, that the Catholique Church *cannot*, and that the *Roman* Church *hath not* erred againſt any Fundamental Article of Faith: Therefore it cannot be damnable to remain in her Communion; and ſo the pretended corruptions in her doctrins could not induce any obligation to depart from her Communion; nor could excuſe them from Schiſm, who, upon pretence of neceſſity in Point of Conſcience, forſook her. And D. *Potter* will never be able to ſalve a manifeſt contradiction in theſe his words: *To depart from the Church* (a) *of* Rome *in ſome Doctrins and practiſes, there might be neceſſary cauſe, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.* For if, notwithſtanding theſe Doctrins and practiſes, *ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation*; how could it be *neceſſary to Salvation* to forſake her? And therefore we muſt ſtill conclude, that to forſake her was properly an act of *Schiſm*.

20. From the ſelf-ſame ground of the infallibility of the Church in all Fundamental Points, I argue after this manner: The viſible Church cannot be forſaken without damnation, upon pretence that it is damnable to remain in her Communion, by reaſon of corruption in Doctrin; as long as, for the truth of her Faith and belief, ſhe performeth the duty, which ſhe oweth to God, and her Neighbour: As long as ſhe performeth what our Saviour exacts at her hands: as long as ſhe doth, as much as lies in her power to do. But (even according to D. *Potters* Aſſertions) the Church performeth all theſe things, as long ſhe erreth not in Points Fundamental, although ſhe were ſuppoſed to err in other Points not Fundamental: Therefore, the Communion of the viſible Church cannot be forſaken without damnation, upon pretence that it is damnable to remain in her Communion, by reaſon of corruption in Doctrin. The *Major*, or firſt Propoſition, of it ſelf is evident. The *Minor*, or ſecond Propoſition, doth neceſſarily follow out of D. *Potter*'s own Doctrin above-rehearſed, that the *promiſes of our Lord made to his Church for his aſſiſtance, are to be* (b) *extended only to Points of Faith, or Fundamental*; (b) *Pag.* 151. (Let me note here by the way that by his (*or*) he ſeems to exclude from Faith all Points which are not Fundamental, and ſo we may deny innumerable Texts of Scripture:) That, *It is* (c) *comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capital dangers, &c. but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſin and error, till ſhe be in heaven.* (c) *Pag.* 155. For it is evident, that the Church (for as much as concerns the truth of her Doctrins and belief) owes no more duty to God and her Neighbour; neither doth our Saviour exact more at her hands, nor is it in her power to do, more than God doth aſſiſt her to do; which aſſiſtance is promiſed only for Points Fundamental; and conſequently as long as ſhe teacheth no Fundamental error, her Communion cannot without damnation be forſaken. And we may fitly apply againſt D. *Potter* a Concionatory declamation which he makes againſt us, where he ſaith: *May the Church of after-Ages make the narrow way to heaven, narrower than our Saviour left it*, &c? (d) *Pag.* 221. ſince he himſelf obligeth men under pain of damnation to forſake the Church, by reaſon of errors; againſt which our Saviour thought it needleſs to promiſe his aſſiſtance, and for which he neither denyeth his grace in this life, or glory in the next. Will D. *Potter* oblige the Church to do more then ſhe *may* even hope for, or to perform on earth that which is proper to heaven alone?

21. And as from your own Doctrin concerning the infallibility of the Church in Fundamental Points, we have proved that it was a grievous ſin to forſake her: ſo do we take a ſtrong argument from the fallibility of any who dare pretend to reform the Church, which any man in his wits will believe to be indued with at leaſt as much infallibility as private men can challenge; and D. *Potter* expreſly affirmeth, that Chriſts promiſes of his aſſiſtance *are not intended* (e) *to any particular perſons or Churches:* (e) *Pag.* 151. and therefore to leave the Church by reaſon of errors, was at beſt hand but to flit from one erring company to another, without any new *hope* of triumphing over errors, and, without neceſſity, or utility, to forſake that Communion of which S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *There is* (f) *no juſt neceſſity to divide unity.* (f) *Ep. cont. Parmen. lib.* 2. *c.* 11. Which will appear to be much more evident, if we conſider, that though the Church had maintained ſome falſe Doctrins, yet to leave her Communion to remedy the old, were but to add a new increaſe of errors, ariſing from the innumerable diſagreements of Sectaries, which muſt needs bring with it a mighty maſs of falſehoods, becauſe the truth is but one, and indiviſible. And this reaſon is yet ſtronger; if we ſtill remember, that even according to D. *Potter*, the viſible Church hath a bleſſing not to err in Points Fundamental, in which any private *Reformer* may fail: and therefore they could not pretend any neceſſity to forſake that Church, out of whoſe Communion they were expoſed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable errors. Remember I pray you, what your ſelf affirms (*pag.* 69.) where ſpeaking of our Church and yours, you ſay: *All the difference is from the weeds which remain there, and here are taken away; Yet neither here perfectly, nor every where alike.* Behold a fair confeſſion of corruptions, ſtill remaining in your Church, which you can only excuſe by ſaying they are not Fundamental, as likewiſe thoſe in the *Roman* Church are confeſſed to be not Fundamental. What man of judgment will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupt one?

22. I ſtill proceed to impugn you expreſly upon your own grounds. You ſay, *That it is comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capital dangers: but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſin, and error, till ſhe be in heaven.* Now if it be comfort *enough* to be ſecured from all capital dangers, which can ariſe only from error in Fundamental Points: why were not your firſt Reformers content with *enough*, but would needs diſmember the Church, out of a pernicious greedineſs of more than *enough*? For, this *enough*, which according to you is attained by not erring in

Points

Points Fundamental, was enjoyed before *Luther*'s reformation, unleſs you will now againſt your ſelf affirm, that long before *Luther* there was no Church free from error in Fundamental Points. Moreover if (as you ſay) no Church may hope *to triumph over all error till ſhe be in heaven*; You muſt either grant, that errors not Fundamental cannot yield ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or elſe you muſt affirm that all Community may, and ought to be forſaken, and ſo there will be no end of Schiſms: or rather indeed there can be no ſuch thing as Schiſm, becauſe, according to you, all communities are ſubject to errors not Fundamental, for which, if they may be lawfully forſaken; it followeth clearly that it is not Schiſm to forſake them. Laſtly, ſince it is not lawful to leave the Communion of the Church for abuſes in life and manners, becauſe ſuch miſeries cannot be avoided, in this world of temptation: and ſince according to your Aſſertion no *Church may hope to triumph over all ſin and error*: You muſt grant, that, as ſhe ought not to be left by reaſon of ſin; ſo neither by reaſon of errors not Fundamental: becauſe both *ſin*, and *error* are (according to you) impoſſible to be avoided, till ſhe be in heaven.

23. Furthermore, I ask, Whether it be the *Quantity* and *Number*, or *Quality* and *Greatneſs of* doctrinal errors that may yield ſufficient cauſe to relinquiſh the Churches Communion? I prove that neither. Not the *Quality*, which is ſuppoſed to be beneath the degree of Points Fundamental, or neceſſary to Salvation. Not the *Quantity* or Number: for the foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport all ſuch *unneceſſary additions*, as you tearm them. And if they once weighed ſo heavy as to overthrow the foundation, they ſhould grow to Fundamental errors, into which your ſelf teach the Church cannot fall. *Hay and ſtubble* (ſay you) *and ſuch* (g) *unprofitable ſtuffe, laid on the roof, deſtroys not the houſe, whileſt the main pillars are ſtanding on the foundation.* And, tell us, I pray you, the preciſe number of errors which cannot be tolerated? I know you cannot do it; and therefore being *uncertain*, whether or no you have cauſe to leave the Church, you are *certainly* obliged not to forſake her. Our bleſſed Saviour hath declared his will, that we forgive a private offender ſeventy ſeven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of treſpaſſes; and why then dare you alledge his command, that you muſt not pardon his Church for errors, acknowledged to be not Fundamental? What excuſe can you feign to your ſelves; who for Points not neceſſary to Salvation, have been occaſions, cauſes, and Authors of ſo many miſchiefs, as could not but unavoidably accompany ſo huge a breach in Kingdoms, in Common-wealths, in private perſons, in publique Magiſtrates, in body, in ſoul, in goods, in life, in Church, in the State, by Schiſms, by rebellions, by war, by famin, by plague, by bloud-ſhed, by all ſorts of imaginable calamities upon the whole face of the earth, wherein as in a map of Deſolation, the heavineſs of your crime appears, under which the world doth pant?

(g) *Pag.* 155.

24. To ſay for your excuſe, that you left not the Church, but her errors, doth not extenuate, but aggravate your ſin. For by this device, you ſow ſeeds of endleſs Schiſms, and put into the mouth of al Separatiſts, a ready Anſwer how to avoid the note of *Schiſm* from your Proteſtant Church of *England*, or from any other Church whatſoever. They will, I ſay, anſwer as you do prompt, that your Church may be forſaken, if ſhe fall into errors, though they be not Fundamental: and further, that no Church muſt hope to be free from ſuch errors; which two grounds being once laid, it will not be hard to infer the conſequence, that ſhe may be forſaken.

25. From ſome other words of D. *Potter* I likewiſe prove, that for Errors not Fundamental, the Church ought not to be forſaken, *There neither was* (ſaith he) *nor can be* (h) *any juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf. To depart from a particular Church, and namely from the Church of* Rome, *in ſome Doctrins and practiſes, there might be juſt and neceſſary cauſe, though the Church of* Rome *wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.* Mark his Doctrin, that there *can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt*: and yet he teacheth that the Church of Chriſt may err in Points not Fundamental; Therefore (ſay I) we cannot forſake the *Roman* Church for Points not Fundamental, for then we might alſo forſake the Church of Chriſt, which your ſelf deny: and I pray you conſider, whether you do not plainly contradict your ſelf, while in the words above recited, you ſay there can be no *juſt cauſe to forſake* the Catholique Church; and yet that there may be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of *Rome*, ſince you grant that the Church of Chriſt may err in Points not Fundamental: and that the *Roman* Church hath erred only in ſuch Points; as by and by we ſhall ſee more in particular. And thus much be ſaid to diſprove their chiefeſt Anſwer, that they left not the Church, but her *corruptions*.

(h) *Pag.* 75.

26. Another evaſion D. *Potter* bringeth, to avoid the imputation of *Schiſm*, and it is, becauſe they ſtill acknowledg the Church of *Rome* to be a *Member of the body of Chriſt*, and not *cut off from the hope of Salvation. And this* (ſaith he) *clears us from the* (i) *imputation of Schiſm, whoſe property it is, to cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it ſeparates.*

(i) *Pag.* 76.

27. This is an Anſwer which perhaps you may get ſome one to approve, if firſt you can put him out of his wits. For what prodigious Doctrins are theſe? Thoſe Proteſtants who believe that the Church erred in Points neceſſary to Salvation, and for that cauſe left her, cannot be excuſed from damnable *Schiſm*: But others who believed that ſhe had no damnable errors, did very well, yea were obliged to forſake her: and (which is more miraculous, or rather monſtrous) they did well to forſake her formally and preciſely, *becauſe* they *judged*, that ſhe retained all means neceſſary to Salvation. I ſay, *becauſe* they ſo *judged*. For the very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelf, and condemneth thoſe others as Schiſmatiques, is, becauſe he holdeth that the Church which both of them forſook, is not cut off from the *Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation*; whereas thoſe other Zelots deny her to be a member of Chriſts body, or capable of Salvation, wherein alone they diſagree from D. *Potter*: for in the effect of ſeparation they agree, only they do it upon a different motive or reaſon. Were it not a ſtrange excuſe, if a man would think to cloak his rebellion, by alleadging that he held the perſon againſt whom he rebelleth to be his lawful Soveraign? And yet D. *Potter* thinks himſelf

himself free from Schism, because he forsook the Church of *Rome*; but yet so, as that still he held her to be the true Church, and to have all necessary means to Salvation. But I will no further urge this most solemn foppery, and do much more willingly put all Catholiques in mind what an unspeakable comfort it is, that our Adversaries are forced to confess, that they cannot clear themselves from *Schism*, otherwise than by acknowledging that they do not, nor cannot, *cut off from the hope of Salvation* our Church. Which is as much as if they should in plain terms say: They must be damned, unless we may be saved. Moreover, this evasion doth indeed condemn your zealous brethren of *Heresie*, for denying the Churches perpetuity, but doth not clear your self from *Schism*, which consists in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of Faith, as you must profess your self to agree with the Church of *Rome* in all Fundamental Articles. For otherwise, you should cut her off from the hope of Salvation, and so condemn your self of *Schism*. And lastly, even according to this your own definition of *Schism*, you cannot clear your self from that crime, unless you be content to acknowledge a manifest contradiction in your own Assertions. For if you do not cut us off *from the body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation*; how come you to say in another place, that you judge a *reconciliation* with us *to be* (k) *damnable?* That to depart *from the Church of* Rome, *there might be just and necessary* (l) *cause?* That *they that have the understanding and means to discover their error, and neglect to use them* (m) *we dare not flatter them* (say you) *with so easie a censure*, of hope of Salvation? If then it be (as you say) a property of *Schism*, to cut off from the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates: how will you clear your self from *Schism*, who dare not flatter us with so easie a censure? and who affirm that a reconciliation with us is *damnable?* But the truth is, there is no constancy in your Assertions, by reason of difficulties which press you on all sides. For, you are loath to affirm cleerly, that we may be saved, lest such a grant might be occasion (as in all reason it ought to be) of the conversion of Protestants to the *Roman* Church: And on the other side, if you affirm that our Church erred in Points Fundamental, or necessary to Salvation, you know not how, nor where, nor among what company of men, to find a perpetual visible Church of Christ, before *Luther:* And therefore your best shift is to say, and unsay, as your occasions command. I do not examine your Assertion, that it is the property of Schism, *to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates:* wherein you are mightily mistaken, as appears by your own example of the *Donatists*, who were most formal and proper *Heretiques*, and not *Schismatiques*, as *Schism* is a vice distinct from *Heresie*. Besides, although the *Donatists*, and *Luciferians* (whom you also alledge) had been meer Schismatiques, yet it were against all good Logick, from a particular, to infer a general Rule, to determine what is the property of *Schism*.

(k) *Pag.* 20.
(l) *Pag* 77.
(m) *Pag.* 79.

28. A third device I find in D. *Potter* to clear his brethren from Schism, *There is* (saith he) *great difference between* (n) *a Schism from them, and a Reformation of our selves.*

(n) *Pag.* 75.

29. This, I confess, is a quaint subtilty, by which all Schism and Sin may be as well excused. For what devil incarnate could meerly pretend a separation, and not rather some other motive, of vertue, truth, profit, or pleasure? But now since their pretended *Reformation* consisted, as they gave out, in forsaking the corruptions of the Church: the *Reformation* of themselves, and their *division* from us, falls out to be one and the self-same thing. Nay we see, that although they infinitely disagree in the particulars of their reformation, yet they symbolize, and consent in the general Point of forsaking our pretended corruptions: An evident sign that the thing, upon which their thoughts first pitched, was not any particular Modell, or Idæa of Religion, but a setled resolution to forsake the Church of *Rome*. Wherefore this Metaphysical speculation, that they intended only to reform themselves, cannot possibly excuse them from *Schism*, unless first they be able to prove that they were obliged to depart from us. Yet for as much as concernes the fact it self; it is clear, that *Luther*'s revolt did not proceed from any zeal of reformation. The motive, which put him upon so wretched, and unfortunate a work, were, Covetousness, Ambition, Lust, Pride, Envy, and grudging that the promulgation of Indulgences, was not committed to himself, or such as he desired. He himself taketh God to witness, that he *fell into these troubles casually, and* (o) *against his will*, not upon any intention of Reformation, not so much as *dreaming or suspecting any change which might* (p) *happen*. And he *began to preach* (against Indulgences) *when he knew not what* (q) *the matter meant*. For (saith he) *I scarcely understood* (r) *then what the name of Indulgences meant*. In so much as afterwards *Luther* did much mislike of his own undertaken course, oftentimes (saith he) *wishing* (s) *that I had never begun that businesse*. And *Fox* saith: *It is apparent that* (t) Luther *promised Cardinal* Cajetan *to keepe silence, provided also his adversaries would do the like*. M. *Cowper* reporteth further, that Luther *by his letter submitted* (u) *himself to the Pope, so that he might not bee compelled to recant*. With much more, which may be seen in (w) *Brereley*. But this is sufficient to shew, that *Luther* was far enough from intending any Reformation. And if he judged a *Reformation* to be necessary, what a huge wickedness was it in him, to promise *silence, if his adversaries would do the like?* Or to submit *himself to the Pope, so that he might not be compelled to recant?* Or if the Reformation were not indeed *intended* by him, nor judged to be *necessary*, how can he be excused from damnable *Schism?* And this is the true maner of *Luther*'s revolt, taken from his own acknowledgments, and the words of the more ancient Protestants themselves, whereby D. *Potter*'s faltring, and mincing the matter, is clearly discovered, and confuted. Upon what motives our Country was divided from the *Roman* Church by King *Henry* the Eighth, and how the Schism was continued by Queen *Elizabeth*, I have no heart to rip up The world knoweth, it was not upon any zeal of *Reformation*.

(o) *Casu non voluntate in has turbas incidi, Deum ipsum testor.*
(p) *Act. et Mon. Pag.* 404.
(q) *Sleidan. l.* 16, *fol.* 232.
(r) *Sleid. lib.* 13. *fol.* 177.
(s) *Luth in colloq. mensal.*
(t) *Act. Mon. Pag. pag.* 404.
(u) *Cowp. in his Chronicle.*

30. But you will prove your former evasion by a couple of Similitudes: *If a Monastery* (x) *should reform it self, and should reduce into practise, ancient good discipline, when others would not; in this case could it in reason be charged with Schism from others, or with Apostasie from its rule and order? Or as in a society of men universally infected with some disease, they that should free themselves from the common disease could not be therefore said to separate from the society, so neither can the reformed Churches be truly accused for making a Schism from the Church, seeing all they did, was to reform themselves.*

(w) *Tract.* 2. *cap* 2. *Sect.* 11. *Subd.* 2.
(x) *Pag.* 81, 82.

31. I was very glad to find you in a Monastery, but sorry when I perceived that you were inventing wayes how to forsake your Vocation, and to maintain the lawfulness of Schism from the Church, and Apostasie from a Religious Order. Yet before you make your final resolution, hear a word of advice Put case; That a Monastery did confessedly observe their substantial vowes and all principal Statutes, or Constitutions of the Order, though with some neglect of lesser Monastical Observances: And that a Reformation were undertaken, not by authority of lawful Superiors, but by some One, or very few in comparison of the rest: And those few known to be led, not with any spirit of Reformation, but by some other sinister intention: and that the Statutes of the House were even by those busie fellowes confessed, to have been time out of minde understood, and practised as now they were: And further, that the pretended Reformers acknowledge that themselves as soon as they were gone out of their Monastery, must not hope to be free from those or the like errors and corruptions, for which they left their Bretheren: And (which is more) that they might fall into more enormous crimes than they *did*, or *could* do in their Monastery, which we suppose to be *secured* from all substantial corruptions, for the avoiding of which they have an infallible assistance. Put (I say) together all these my *And's* and then come with your *If's*, *If a Monastery should reform it self &c.* and tell me if you could excuse such Reformers from Schism, Sedition, Rebellion, Apostasie, &c? what would you say of such Reformers in your Colledge? or tumultuous Persons in a Kingdome? Remember now your own Tenents, and then reflect how fit a similitude you have picked out, to prove your self a *Schismatique*. You teach that the Church may erre in Points not Fundamental, but that for all Fundamental Points she is *secured* from error: You teach that no particular Person, or Church, hath any promise of assistance in Points Fundamental. You, and the whole world can witness that when *Luther* began, he being but only *One*, oppoled himself *to All*, as well subjects, as superiours; and that even then when he himself confessed that he had no intention of Reformation: You cannot be ignorant but that many chiefe learned Protestants are forced to confess the Antiquity of our Doctrin and Practice, and to several and many Controversies, acknowledge that the Ancient Fathers stood on our Side: Consider, I say, these Points, and see whether your similitude do not condemn your Progenitors of *Schism* from God's visible *Church*, yea and of *Apostasie* also from their Religious *Orders*, if they were vowed Regulars, as *Luther*, and divers of them were.

32. From the Monastery you are fled into an Hospital *of persons universally infected with some disease*, where you finde to be true what I supposed, that after your departure from your Bretheren you might fall into greater inconveniences, and more *infectious diseases*, than those for which you left *them*. But you are also upon the Point to abandon these miserable needy persons, in whose behalfe for Charities sake, let me set before you these considerations. If the disease neither *were*, nor *could* be mortal, because in that Company of men God had placed a Tree of life: If going thence, the sick man might by curious tasting the Tree of Knowledge eate poyson under pretence of bettering his health: If he could not hope thereby to avoid other diseases like those for which he had quitted the company of the first infected men: If by his departure innumerable mischiefes were to ensue; could such a man without senselessenes be excused by saying, that he sought *to free himself from the common disease*, but not forsooth *to separate from the society?* Now your self compare the Church to a man deformed with (y) *superfluous fingers and toes*, but yet who hath not *lost* any *vital part*: you acknowledg that out of her society no man is secured from damnable Error, and the world can bear witness what unspeakable mischiefes and calamities ensued *Luther*'s revolt from the Church. Pronounce then concerning them, the same sentence which even now I have shewed them to deserve, who in the maner aforesaid should *separate from* persons *universally* infected with some disease.

(y) *Pag.* 154.

33. But alas, to what pass hath Heresie brought men, who tearm themselves Christians, and yet blush not to compare the beloved Spouse of our Lord, the one Dove, the purchase of our Saviours most precious blood, the holy Catholique Church, I mean that visible Church of Christ which *Luther* found spread over the whole world; to a Monastery, so disordered that it must be forsaken; to the *Gyant in Gath, much deformed with superfluous fingers and toes*; to a *society of men universally infected with some disease!* And yet all these Comparisons, and much worse, are neither injurious, nor undeserved, if once it be granted, or can be proved, that the visible Church of Christ may erre in any one Point of Faith, although not Fundamental.

34. Before I part from these similitudes, one thing I must observe against the evasion of D. *Potter*, that they left not the *Church*, but her Corruptions. For as those Reformers of the Monastery, or those other who left the company of men universally infected with some disease, would deny themselves to be *Schismatiques*, or any way blame-worthy, but could not deny, but that they left the said Communities: So *Luther* and the rest cannot so much as pretend, not to have left the visible Church, which according to them was infected with many diseases, but can only pretend that they did not sin in leaving her. And you speak very strangely when you say: *In a society of men universally infected with some disease, they that should free themselves from the common disease, could not be therefore said to separate from the Society.* For if they do not separate themselves from the Society of the infected persons; how do they free themselves and depart from the common disease? Do they at the same time remain *in the company*, and yet depart *from* those infected creatures? Wee must then say, that they *separate* themselves from the persons, though it be by occasion of the disease: Or if you say, they free their own persons from the common disease, yet so, that they remaine still in the Company infected, subject to the Superiours and Governours thereof, eating and drinking, and keeping publique Assemblies with them; you cannot but know, that *Luther* and your Reformers, the first pretended free persons from the supposed common infection of the *Romane* Church, did not so: for they endeavoured to force the Society whereof they were parts, to be healed and reformed as they were; and if it refused, they did, when they had forces, drive them away, even their Superiours both Spirituall and Temporall, as is notorious. Or if they had not power to expel that supposed infected Community, or Church of that place, they departed from them corporally, whom mentally they had forsaken before. So that you

cannot

cannot deny, but *Luther* forſook the external Communion, and commpany of the Catholique Church, for which, as your ſelf (z) confeſs, *There neither was nor can be any juſt cauſe, no more than to depart from Chriſt himſelf.* We do therefore infer, that *Luther* and the reſt who forſook that viſible Church which they found upon earth, were truly, and *properly Schiſmatiques.* (z) *Pag.* 75.

35. Moreover, it is evident that there was a diviſion between *Luther* and that Church which was Viſible when he aroſe: but that Church cannot be ſaid to have divided her ſelf from him, before whoſe time ſhe was, and in compariſon of whom ſhe was a *whole*, and he but a *part*: therefore we muſt ſay, that he divided himſelf and went out of her; which is to be a *Schiſmatique*, or *Heretique*, or both. By this argument, *Optatus Melivitanus* proveth, that not *Cæcilianus*, but *Parmenianus* was a Schiſmatique, ſaying? *For*, Cæcilianus *went* (a) *not out of* Majorinus *thy Grandfather, but* Majorinus *from* Cecilianus: *neither did* Cæcilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or* Cyprian, *but* Majorinus, *in whoſe Chayr thou ſitteſt, which had no beginning before* Majorinus. *Since it manifeſtly appeareth that theſe things were acted in this manner, it is clear, that you are heirs both of the deliverers up* (of the holy Bible to be burned) *and alſo of Schiſmatiques.* The Whole argument of this holy Father makes directly both againſt *Luther*, and all thoſe who continue the diviſion which he begun; and proves, That *going out*, convinceth thoſe who go out, to be Schiſmatiques; but not thoſe from whom they depart: That to forſake the Chair of *Peter* is *Schiſm*; yea, that it is *Schiſm* to erect a Chair which had no origin, or as it were predeceſſour, before it ſelf: That to continue in a diviſion begun by others, is to be *Heires of Schiſmatiques*; and laſtly, that to depart from the Communion of a particular Church (as that of S. *Cyprian* was) is ſufficient to make a man incur the guilt of *Schiſm*, and conſequently, that although Proteſtants, who deny the Pope to be ſupream Head of the Church, do think by that *Hereſie* to clear *Luther* from Schiſm, in diſobeying the Pope: Yet that will not ſerve to free him from *Schiſm*, as it importeth a diviſion from the obedience, or Communion of the particular Biſhop, Dioceſs, Church, and Country where he lived. (a) *Lib.* 1. *cont. Parmen.*

36. But it is not the Hereſie of Proteſtants, or any other Sectaries, that can deprive S. *Peter*, and his Succeſſors, of the authority which Chriſt our Lord conferred upon them over his whole militant Church: which is a Point confeſſed by learned Proteſtants to be of great Antiquity, and for which the judgement of divers moſt ancient holy Fathers is reproved by them, as may be ſeen at large in *Brerely* (b) exactly citing the places of ſuch chief Proteſtants. And we muſt ſay with S. *Cyprian*: *Hereſies* (c) *have ſprung, and Schiſms been bred from no other cauſe then for that the Prieſt of God is not obeyed, nor one Prieſt and Judge is conſidered to be for the time in the Church of God.* Which words do plainly condemn *Luther*, whether he will underſtand them as ſpoken of the *univerſal*, or of every *particular* Church. For he withdrew himſelf both from the obedience of the Pope, and of all particular Biſhops, and Churches. And no leſs clear is the ſaid *Optatus Melivitanus*, ſaying: *Thou canſt not deny* (d) *but that thou knoweſt, that in the City of* Rome, *there was firſt an Epiſcopal Chair placed for* Peter, *wherein* Peter *the head of all the Apoſtles ſate, whereof alſo he was called Cephas; in which one Chair, unity was to be kept by all, leſt the other Apoſtles might attribute to themſelves, each one his particular Chair; and that he ſhould be a Schiſmatique and ſinner, who againſt that one ſingle Chair ſhould erect another.* Many other authorities of Fathers might be alleadged to this purpoſe, which I omit; my intention being, not to handle particular controverſies. (b) *Tract.* 1. *Sect.* 3. *ſubd.* 10. (c) *Ep.* 55. (d) *Lib.* 2. *cont. Parmen.*

37. Now, the arguments which hitherto I have brought, prove that *Luther*, and his followers were Schiſmatiques, without examining (for as much as belongs to this Point) whether or no the Church can erre in any one thing great or ſmall, becauſe it is univerſally true, that there can be no juſt cauſe to forſake the Communion of the viſible Church of Chriſt, according to S. *Auguſtin*, ſaying: *It is not poſſible* (e) *that any may have juſt cauſe to ſeparate their Communion, from the Communion of the whole world, and call themſelves the Church of Chriſt, as if they had ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of all Nations upon juſt cauſe.* But ſince indeed the Church cannot erre in any one Point of Doctrin, nor can approve any corruption in manners; they cannot with any colour avoid the juſt imputation of *eminent* Schiſm, according to the verdict of the ſame holy Father in theſe words: *The moſt manifeſt* (f) *ſacriledge of Schiſm is eminent, when there was no cauſe of ſeparation.* (e) *Ep.* 48. (f) *De Bapt. lib.* 5. *cap.* 1.

38. Laſtly, I prove that Proteſtants cannot avoid the note of *Schiſm*, at leaſt by reaſon of their mutual ſeparation from one another. For moſt certain it is that there is very great difference, for the outward face of a Church, amd profeſſion of a different faith, between the *Lutherans*, the rigid *Calviniſts*, and *Proteſtants*, of *England*. So that if *Luther* were in the right, thoſe other Proteſtants who invented Doctrins far different from his, and divided themſelues from him, muſt be reputed *Schiſmatiques*: and the like argument may proportionably be aplyed to their further diviſions, and ſubdiviſions. Which reaſon I yet urge more ſtrongly out of D. *Potter*, (g) who affirmes, that to him and to ſuch as are convicted in conſcience of the errors of the *Roman Church*, a reconciliation is *impoſſible*, and *damnable*. And yet he teacheth, that their differnce from the *Roman Church*, is not in Fundamental Points. Now, ſince among Proteſtants there is ſuch diverſity of belief, that one denieth what the other affirmeth, they muſt be convicted in conſcience that one part is in error (at leaſt not Fundamental,) and, if D. *Potter* will ſpeak conſequently, that a reconciliation between them is *impoſſible*, and *damnable*: and what greater diviſion, or *Schiſm* can there be, than when one part muſt judge a reconciliation with the other to be *impoſſible*, and *damnable*. (g) *Pag.* 26.

39. Out of all which premiſſes, this *Concluſion* followes: That *Luther* and his followers were *Schiſmatiques*; from the univerſal viſible Church; from the Pope Chriſts vicar on earth, and Succeſſour to S. *Peter*; from the particular Dioceſs in which they received Baptiſm; from the Country or Nation to which they belonged; from the Biſhop under whom they lived; many of them from the Religious Order in which they were profeſſed; from one another; And Laſtly, from a mans ſelf (as much as is poſſible) becauſe the ſelf-ſame Proteſtant to day *is convicted in conſcience*, that his yeſterday's Opinion was an error (as D. *Potter* knows a man in the world who from a Puritan was turned to a moderate Proteſtant) with whom therefore a reconciliation, according to D. *Potter*'s grounds, is both *impoſſible*, and *damnable*.

40. It seems D. *Potters* last refuge to excuse himself and his Brethren from Schism, is, because they proceeded according to their conscience, dictating an obligation, under damnation, to forsake the errors maintained by the Church of *Rome*. His words are: *Although we confess the* (h) *Church of Rome to be (in some sense) a true Church, and her errours to some men not damnable: yet for us who are convinced in conscience, that she erres in many things, a necessity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forsake her in those errors.*

(h) Pag. 82.

41. I answer: It is very strange, that you judge us extreamly Uncharitable, in saying, Protestants cannot be saved; while your self avouch the same of all learned Catholiques, whom ignorance cannot excuse. If this your pretence of conscience may serve, what Schismatique in the Church, what popular seditious brain in a Kingdom, may not alledge the dictamen of conscience to free themselves from *Schism*, or *Sedition*? No man wishes them to do any thing against their conscience; but we say, that they may, and ought to rectifie, and depose such a conscience, which is *easie* for them to do, even according to your own affirmation, that we Catholiques want no means necessary to Salvation. Easie to do? Nay not to do so, to any man in his right wits must seem *impossible*. For how can these two apprehensions stand together: In the *Roman* Church, I enjoy all means necessary to Salvation, and yet I cannot hope to be saved in that Church? or, Who can enjoyn in one brain (not crackt) these Assertions; After due examination I judge the *Roman* errors not to be in themselves fundamental, or damnable; and yet, I judge that according to true reason, it is damnable to hold them? I say, *according to true reason*. For if you grant your conscience to be *erroneous*, in judging that you cannot be saved in the *Roman* Church, by reason of her errours; there is no other remedy, but that you must rectifie your erring conscience, by your other judgment, that her errors are not fundamental, nor damnable. And this is no more Charity, than you daily afford to such other Protestants as you term Brethren, whom you cannot deny to be in some errors, (unless you will hold, That of contradictory Propositions both may be true) and yet you do not judge it damnable to live in their Communion, because you hold their errors not to be fundamental. You ought to know, that according to the Doctrin of all Divines, there is great difference between a speculative perswasion, and a practical dictamen of conscience: And therefore although they had in speculation conceived the visible Church to err in some doctrins, of themselves not damnable; yet with that speculative judgment they might, and ought to have entertained this practical dictamen, that for Points not substantial to Faith, they neither were bound, nor lawfully could break the bond of Charity, by breaking unity in God's Church. You say that, *hay and stubble* (i) *and such unprofitable stuffe* (as are corruptions in Points not fundamental) *laid on the roof, destroyes not the house, whilst the main pillars are standing on the foundation.* And you would think him a mad man who to be rid of such stuffe, would set his house on fire, that so he might walk in the light, as you teach that *Luther* was obliged to forsake the house of God, for an unnecessary light, not without a combustion formidable to the whole Christian world; rather than bear with some errors which did not destroy the foundation of Faith. And as for others who entred in at the breach first made by *Luther*, they might, and ought to have guided their consciences by that most reasonable rule of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, delivered in these words, *Indeed it is a matter of great* (k) *moment, and both most profitable to be learned, and necessary to be remembred, and which we ought again and again to illustrate, and inculcate with weighty heaps of examples, that almost all Catholiques may know, that they ought to receive the Doctors with the Church, and not forsake the Faith of the Church with the Doctors:* And much less should they forsake the Faith of the Church to follow *Luther*, *Calvin*, and such other Novellists. Moreover, though your first Reformers had conceived their own opinions to be *true*; yet they might, and ought to have doubted, whether they were *certain*: because your self affirm, That Infallibility was not promised to any particular Persons, or Churches. And since in cases of *uncertainties*, we are not to leave our Superiour, nor cast off his obedience, or publiquely oppose his Decrees; your Reformers might easily have found a safe way to satisfie their zealous conscience, without a publique breach: especially if with this their *uncertainty*, we call to minde the peaceable possession, and prescription, which by the confession of your own Brethren, the Church, and Pope of *Rome* did for many Ages enjoy. I wish you would examine the works of your Brethren, by the words your self set down to free S. *Cyprian* from *Schism*: every syllable of which words convinceth *Luther*, and his Copartners to be guilty of that crime, and sheweth in what manner they might with great ease, and quietness have rectified their consciences about the pretended errors of the Church. S. *Cyprian* (say you) *was a peaceable* (l) *and modest man, dissented from others in his judgement, but without any breach of Charity, condemned no man (much less any Church) for the contrary opinion. He believed his own Opinion to be true; but believed not that it was necessary, and therefore did not proceed rashly and peremptorily to censure others, but left them to their liberty.* Did your Reformers imitate this manner of proceeding? Did they *censure no man, much less any Church?* S. Cyprian *believed his own Opinion to be true, but believed not that it was necessary, and* THEREFORE *did not proceed rashly and peremptorily to censure others.* You believe the Points wherein *Luther* differs from us, not to be fundamental, or *necessary*; and why do you not thence infer the like THEREFORE, he should not have *proceeded to censure others?* In a word, since their disagreement from us concerned only Points which were not fundamental, they should have believed that they might have been deceived, as well as the whole visible Church, which you say may erre in such Points; and therefore their Doctrins being not certainly *true*, and certainly *not necessary*, they could not give sufficient cause to depart from the Communion of the Church.

(i) Pag. 155.

(k) *Adv. hæres. c. 27*

(l) Pag. 124.

42. In other places you write so much, as may serve us to prove, that *Luther* and his followers ought to have deposed, and rectified their consciences: As for example, when you say, *When the Church* (m) *hath declared herself in any matter of opinion, or of rites; her declaration obliges all her children to peace and external obedience. Nor is it fit, or lawful for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publique.* (as *Luther* and his fellows did) *He may offer his opinion to be considered of, so he do it with evidence, or great probability of Scriptures, or reason, and very modestly, still containing himself within the dutiful respect which he owes: but if he will*

(m) Pag. 105.

will factiously advance his own conceits (his own conceits? and yet grounded upon evidence of Scripture) *and despise the Church so far as to cut off her Communion; he may be justly branded and condemned for a Schismatique, yea and an Heretique also in some degree, and* in foro exteriori, *though his opinion were true, and much more if it be false.* Could any man, even for a Fee, have spoken more home to condemn your Predecessors of *Schism*, or Heresie? Could they have stronger Motives to oppose the Doctrin of the Church, and leave her Communion, than evidence of Scripture? And yet according to your own words, they should have answered, and rectified their conscience, by your Doctrin, that though their opinion *were true*, and grounded upon evidence of *Scripture, or Reason*; yet it was not lawful for any *private man to oppose his judgment to the publique*, which obligeth all Christians *to peace and external obedience*: and if they cast off the Communion of the Church for maintaining their own *Conceits, they may be branded for Schismatiques and Heretiques in some degree, et in foro exteriori*, that is, all other Christians ought so *to esteem* of them, (and why then are we accounted uncharitable for judging so of you?) and they also are obliged to *behave* themselves *in the face of all Christian Churches*, as if indeed they were not Reformers, but *Schismatiques*, and *Heretiques*, or as Pagans and Publicans. I thank you for your ingenuous confession: in recompence whereof, I will do a deed of Charity, by putting you in minde, into what Labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may erre in some Points of Faith, and yet that it is not lawful for any man to oppose his judgement, or leave her Communion, though he have evidence of Scripture against her. Will you have such a man to dissemble against his conscience, or externally deny a truth, known to be contained in holy Scripture? How much more coherently do Catholiques proceed, who believe the universal infallibility of the Church, and from thence are assured, that there can be no evidence of Scripture, or reason, against her definitions, nor any just cause to forsake her Communion? M. *Hooker*, esteemed by many Protestants an incomparable man, yeelds as much as we have alleadged out of you, *The will of God is* (saith he) *to have* (n) *them do whatsoever the sentence of judiciall and final decision shall determine, yea though it seem in their private opinion, to swarve utterly from that which is right.* Doth not this man tell *Luther*, what the will of God was, which he transgressing, must of necessity be guilty of *Schism*? And must not M. *Hooker* either acknowledge the universal infallibility of the Church, or else drive men into the perplexities and labyrinths of dissembling against their conscience, whereof now I speak? Not unlike to this, is your Doctrin delivered elsewhere, *Before the Nicene Councel* (say you) *many* (o) *good Catholique Bishops, were of the same opinion with the Donatists, that the Baptism of Heretiques was ineffectual; and with the Novatians, that the Church ought not to absolve some grievous sinners. These errors therefore* (*if they had gone no further*) *were not in themselves Heretical, especially in the proper, and most heavy, or bitter sense of that word; neither was it in the Churches intention* (*or in her power*) *to make them such by her declaration. Her intention was to silence all disputes, and to settle peace and unity in her government: to which all wise and peacable men submitted, whatsoever their opinion was. And those factious people, for their unreasonable and uncharitable opposition, were very justly branded for Schismatiques. For us, the* Mistaker *will never prove that we oppose any declaration of the Catholique Church, &c. and therefore he doth unjustly charge us either with Schism, or Heresie.* These words manifestly condemne your Reformers, who opposed the visible Church in many of her Declarations, Doctrins, and Commands imposed upon them, for silencing all disputes, *and setling peace and Unity in the government*, and therefore they still remaining obstinately disobedient, are justly *charged with Schism, and Heresie.* And it is to be observed, that you grant the *Donatists* to have been *very justly branded for Schismatiques*, although their opposition against the Church, did concerne (as you hold) a Point not Fundamental to the Faith, and which according to S. *Augustin*, cannot be proved out of Scripture alone; and therefore either doth evidently convince that the Church is universally infallible, even in Points not Fundamental; or else that it is *Schism*, to oppose her Declarations, in those very things wherein she may erre; and consequently that *Luther*, and his fellowes were *Schismatiques*, by opposing the visible Church for Points not Fundamental, though it were (untruly) supposed that she erred in such Points. But, by the way, How come you on the suddain to hold the Determination of a Generall Councell (of *Nice*) to be the declaration of the Catholique Church, seeing you teach, That General Councels may erre even fundamentally? And doe you now say, with us, that to oppose the Declaration of the Church, is sufficient that one may be branded with *Heresie*, which is a Point so often impugned by you?

(n) In his preface to his Bookes of Ecclesiastical Policy. *Sect.* 6. *Pag.* 28.

(o) *Pag.* 131.

43. It is therefore most evident, that no pretended Scruple of *conscience* could excuse *Luther*; which he might, and ought to have rectified by means enough, if Pride, Ambition, Obstinacy, &c. had given him leave. I grant he was touched with scruple of conscience, but it was because he had forsaken the visible Church of Christ; and I beseech all Protestants for the love they beare to that sacred ransome of their soules, the Blood of our Blessed Saviour, attentively to ponder, and unpartially so apply to *their* own *Conscience*, what this Man spoke concerning the feelings, and remorse of his. *How often* (saith he) *did my trembling heart* (p) *beat within me, and, reprehending me, object against me that most strong argument; Art thou only wise? Do so many worlds erre? Were so many ages ignorant? What, if thou errest, and drawest so many into hell to be damned eternally with thee?* And in another place he saith: *Dost thou who art but One, and of no* (q) *account, take upon thee so great matters? What, if thou, being but one, offendest? If God permit such, so many, and all to erre; why may he not permit thee to erre? To this belong those arguments, the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, the Councels, the Customes, the multitudes, and greatness of wise men: Whom do not these Mountains of arguments, these clouds, yea these seas of Examples overthrow?* And these thoughts wrought so deep in his soul that he *often wisht and desired that he had* (r) *never begun this business*: wishing yet further that *his Writings were burned and buried* (s) *in eternal oblivion.* Behold what remorse *Luther* felt, and how he wanted no strength of malice to cross his own conscience: and therefore it was no scruple, or conceived obligation of conscience, but some other motives which induced him to oppose the Church. And if yet you doubt of his courage to encounter, and strength to master all reluctations of conscience, heare an example or two for that purpose.

(p) *Tom.* 2. *Germ. Ien. fol.* 9. *et tom.* 2. *Witt. of anno* 1562. *de abrog. Miss. privat. fol.* 244.

(q) *Tom.* 5. *Ano not. brevis.*

(r) *Colloq. mensal. fol.* 158.

(s) *Præfat. in tom. German. Ien.*

Of Communion under both kinds, thus he ſaith: *If the Councel* (t) *ſhould in any caſe decree this, leaſt of all would we then uſe both kinds; yea rather, in deſpight of the Councel, and the Decree, we would uſe either but one kind only, or neither, or in no caſe both.* Was not *Luther* perſwaded in *Conſcience*, that to uſe neither kind was againſt our Saviours command? Is this, only to *offer his opinion to be conſidered of*, as you ſaid all men ought to do? And, that you may be ſure that he ſpoke from his heart, and, if occaſion had been offered, would have been as good as his word; mark what he ſaith of the Elevation of the Sacrament: *I did know* (u) *the Elevation of the Sacrament to be Idolatrical; yet nevertheleſs I did retain it in the Church at* Wittemberg, *to the end I might vex the Devil* Caroloſtadius. Was not this a Conſcience large and capacious enough, that could ſwallow Idolatry? Why would he not tolerate Idolatry in the Church of *Rome* (as theſe men are wont to blaſpheme) if he could retain it in his own Church at *Wittemberg*? If *Caroloſtadius*, *Luther*'s off-ſpring, was the Devil, who but himſelf muſt be his dam? Is Almighty God wont to lend ſuch Furies to preach the Goſpel? And yet further (which makes moſt directly to the point in hand) *Luther* in his Book of abrogating the *Private Maſs*, exhorts the *Auguſtine* Fryers of *Wittemberg*, who firſt abrogated the Maſs, that, even againſt their Conſcience accuſing them, they ſhould perſiſt in what they had begun, acknowledging that in ſome things he himſelf had done the like. And *Joannes Matheſius*, a Lutheran Preacher ſaith: *Antonius Muſa, the Pariſh Prieſt* (w) *of* Rocklaz, *recounted to me that on a time he heartily moaned himſelf to the Doctor* (he means *Luther*) *that he himſelf could not believe what he preached to others: And that D.* Luther *anſwered; Praiſe and thanks be to God, that this happens alſo to others, for I had thought it had happened only to me.* Are not theſe conſcionable, and fit Reformers? And can they be excuſed from *Schiſm*, under pretence that they held themſelves obliged to forſake the *Roman* Church? If then it be damnable to proceed againſt ones Conſcience, what will become of *Luther*, who againſt his Conſcience, perſiſted in his diviſion from the *Roman* Church?

(t) *De formula miſſæ.*

(u) *In parva Confeſſ.*

Vid. Tan. tom. 2. diſput. 1. q. 2. dub. 4. n. 108.

(w) *In orat. Germ. 12. de Luth.*

44. Some are ſaid to flatter themſelves with another pernicious conceit, that they (forſooth) are not guilty of ſin; Becauſe they were not the *firſt Authors*, but only are the *continuers* of the *Schiſm*, which was already begun.

45. But it is hard to believe, that any man of judgment, can think this excuſe will ſubſiſt, when he ſhall come to give up his final account. For according to this reaſon no Schiſm will be damnable, but only to the Beginners: Whereas contrarily, the longer it continues the worſe it grows to be, and at length degenerates to *Hereſie*; as Wine by long keeping grows to be Vinegar, but not by continuance returns again to his former nature of Wine. Thus S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, that *Hereſie is* (x) *Schiſm inveterate*. And in another place: *We object to you only the* (y) *crime of Schiſm, which you have alſo made to become Hereſie, by evil perſevering therein.* And S. *Hierom* ſaith: *Though Schiſm* (z) *in the beginning may be in ſome ſort underſtood to be different from Hereſie; yet there is no Schiſm which doth not faine to it ſelf ſome Hereſie, that it may ſeem to have departed from the Church upon juſt cauſe.* And ſo indeed it falleth out. For men may begin upon paſſion, but afterward by inſtinct of corrupt nature, ſeeking to maintain their Schiſm as lawful, they fall into ſome Hereſie, without which their Separation could not be juſtified with any colour: as in our preſent caſe the very affirming, that it is lawful to continue a Schiſm unlawfully begun, is an errour againſt the main principle of Chriſtianity, that it is not lawful for any Chriſtian, to live out of Gods Church, within which alone Salvation can be had; Or, that it is not damnable to diſobey her decrees, according to the words of our Saviour: *If he ſhall not hear* (a) *the Church, let him be to thee as a Pagan, or Publican.* And, *He* (b) *that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me.* We heard above *Optatus Mileuitanus* ſaying to *Parmenianus*, that both he, and all thoſe other who continued in the Schiſm begun by *Majorinus*, did inherit their Fore-fathers Schiſm; and yet *Parmenianus*, was the third Biſhop after *Majorinus* in his Sea, and did not *begin*, but only *continue* the Schiſm. *For* (ſaith this holy Father) Cæcilianus (c) *went not out of* Majorinus *thy Grand-father, but* Majorinus *from* Cæcilianus: *neither did* Cæcilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or* Cyprian, *but* Majorinus, *in whoſe Chair thou ſitteſt, which before* Majorinus (Luther) *had no beginning. Seeing it is evident that theſe things paſſed in this manner*, (that for example, *Luther* departed from the Church, and not the Church from *Luther*), *it is clear that you be HEIRS both of the givers up of the Bible to be burned, and of SCHISMATIQUES.* And the Regal Power, or example of *Henry* the Eighth could not excuſe his ſubjects from Schiſm, according to what we have heard out of S. *Chryſoſtom*, ſaying: *Nothing doth ſo much provoke* (d) *the wrath of Almighty God, as that the Church ſhould be divided. Although we ſhould do innumerable good deeds, if we divide the full Eccleſiaſtical Congregation, we ſhall be puniſhed no leſs, than they who did rend his* (natural) *Body; for that was done to the gain of the whole world, though not with that intention, but this hath no good in it at all, but that the greateſt hurt riſeth from it. Theſe things are ſpoken not only to thoſe who bear office, but to ſuch alſo as are governed by them.* Behold therefore, how lyable both *Subjects*, and *Superiours*, are to the ſin of *Schiſm*, if they break the unity of Gods Church. The words of S. *Paul* can in no occaſion be verified more than in this of which we ſpeak. *They who do ſuch things* (e) *are worthy of death: and not only they that do them, but they alſo that conſent with the doers.* In things which are indifferent of their own nature, Cuſtom may be occaſion, that ſome act, not well begun, may in time come to be lawfully continued. But no length of Time, no Quality of Perſons, no Circumſtance of Neceſſity can legitimate actions which are of their own nature unlawful: and therefore diviſion from Chriſts Myſtical Body, being of the number of thoſe Actions, which Divines teach to be *intrinſecè malas, evil of their own nature and eſſence*, no difference of Perſons or Time can ever make it lawful. D. *Potter* ſaith: *There neither was, nor can be any cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf.* And who dares ſay, that it is not damnable to *continue* a Separation from Chriſt? *Preſcription* cannot in conſcience run, when the firſt beginner, and his ſucceſſors are conſcious that the thing to be *preſcribed*, for example, goods or lands, were unjuſtly poſſeſſed at the firſt. Chriſtians are not like ſtrayes, that after a certain time of wandring from their right home, fall from their owner to the Lord of the Soil; but as long as they retain the *indelible Character* of Baptiſm, and live upon earth, they are obliged to acknowledge ſubjection to Gods Church. Humane Laws may come to nothing by diſcontinuance of time, but the Law of God, commanding

(a) Mat. 18.
(b) Luk. 10. 16.

(c) *Lib. 1. cont. Parm.*

(d) *Hom. 11. in ep. ad Eph.*

(e) Rom. 1. 31.

(x) *Lib. 2. cont. Creſc. c. 7.*
(y) *Ep. 164.*
(z) Upon theſe words *ad Tit. 3. Hæreticum hominem*, &c.

commanding us to conserve Unity in his Church, doth still remain. The continued disobedience of Children cannot deprive Parents of their parental right, nor can the Grand-child be undutiful to his Grand-Father, because his Father was unnatural to his own Parent. The longer Gods Church is so disobeyed; the profession of her Doctrin denyed; her Sacraments neglected; her Liturgy condemned; her Unity violated: the more grievous the fault grows to be: As the longer a man withholds a due debt, or retains his neighbours goods, the greater injustice he commits. Constancy in evil doth not extenuate, but aggravate the same, which by extension of time, receiveth increase of strength, and addition of greater malice. If these mens conceits were true, the Church might come to be wholly divided by wicked Schisms, and yet after some space of time, none could be accused of Schism, nor be obliged to return to the visible Church of Christ: and so there should remain no one true visible Church. Let therefore these men who pretend to honour, reverence, and believe the Doctrin, and practice of the Visible Church, and to condemn their forefathers who forsook her, and say, They would not have done so, if they had lived in the dayes of their Fathers, and yet follow their example in remaining divided from her Communion; consider how truly these words of our Saviour fall upon them, *Woe be to you, because you build* (f) *the Prophets Sepulchers, and garnish the monuments of just men, and say: If we had been in our Fathers dayes, we had not been their fellows in the bloud of the Prophets. Therefore you are a testimony to your own selves, that you are the sons of them that killed the Prophets; and fill up the measure of your Fathers.* (f) Mat. 23. ver. 29, &c.

46. And thus having demonstrated that *Luther*, his Associates, and all that continue in the Schism by them begun, are guilty of *Schism*, by departing from the visible true Church of Christ; it remaineth that we examin what in particular was that visible true Church, from which they departed, that so they may know to what Church in particular they ought to return: and then we shall have performed what was proposed to be handled in the fifth Point.

47. That the *Roman* Church (I speak not for the present, of the particular Dioceses of *Rome*, but of all visible Churches dispersed throughout the whole world, agreeing in Faith with the Chair of *Peter*, whether that Sea were supposed to be in the City of *Rome*, or in any other place:) That (I say) the Church of *Rome*, in this sense, was the visible Catholique Church out of which *Luther* departed, is proved by your own confession, who assign for notes of the Church, the true Preaching of Gods Word, and due administration of Sacraments, both which for the substance you cannot deny to the *Roman* Church, since you confess, that she wanted nothing Fundamental, or necessary to Salvation, and for that very cause you think to clear your self from Schism, *whose property*, as you say, *is to cut off from the* (g) *Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates.* Now that *Luther* and his fellows were born and baptized in the *Roman* Church, and that she was the Church out of which they departed, is notoriously known: and therefore you cannot cut her off *from the Body of Christ, and hope of Salvation*, unless you will acknowledge your self to deserve the just imputation of *Schism*. Neither can you deny her to be truly Catholique by reason of (pretended) corruptions, not Fundamental. For your self avouch, and endeavour to prove, that the true Catholique Church may err in such Points. Moreover, I hope, you will not so much as go about to prove, that when *Luther* rose, there was any other true visible Church, *disagreeing* from the *Roman*, and agreeing with Protestants in their particular Doctrins: and you cannot deny, but that *England* in those days agreed with *Rome*, and other Nations with *England*: And therefore either Christ had no visible Church upon Earth, or else you must grant that it was the Church of *Rome*. A truth so manifest, that those Protestants who affirm the *Roman* Church to have lost the nature and being of a true Church, do by inevitable consequence grant, that for divers ages Christ had no visible Church on earth: from which error, because D. *Potter* disclaimeth, he must of necessity maintain, that the *Roman* Church is free from Fundamental, and damnable error, and that *she is not cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation: And if* (saith he) *any Zelots amongst us have proceeded* (h) *to heavier censures, their zeal may be excused, but their Charity and wisdom cannot be justified.*

5. Point. *Luther* and the rest departed from the *Roman* Church.

(g) *Pag.* 76.

(h) *Ibid.*

48. And to touch particulars, which perhaps some may object. No man is ignorant that the *Grecians*, even the Schismatical *Grecians*, do in most Points agree with *Roman* Catholiques, and disagree from the Protestant Reformation. They teach Transubstantiation, (which Point D. *Potter* also (i) confesseth;) Invocation of Saints and Angels; Veneration of Reliques, and Images; Auricular Confession; enjoyned Satisfaction; Confirmation with Chrism; Extream Unction; All the seven Sacraments; Prayer, Sacrifice, Alms for the dead; Monachism; That Priests may not marry after their Ordination. In which Points that the *Grecians* agree with the *Roman* Church appeareth by a Treatise published by the Protestant Divines of *Wittemberg*, intituled, *Acta Theologorum Wittembergensium. & Jeremiæ Patriarchæ Constantinop. de Augustana confessione*, &c. *Wittembergæ anno* 1584. by the Protestant (k) *Crispinus*, and by Sir *Edwin Sands* in the Relation of the State of Religion of the West. And I wonder with what colour of truth (to say no worse) D. *Potter* could affirm, that the Doctrins *debated between the Protestants* (l), and Rome, *are only the partial and particular fancies of the* Roman *Church; unless happily the opinion of Transubstantiation may be excepted, wherein the latter* Grecians *seem to agree with the* Romanists. Beside, the Protestant Authors already cited, *Petrus Arcudius* a *Grecian*, and a learned Catholique Writer, hath published a large Volume, the Argument and Title whereof is: *Of the agreement of the* Roman, *and* Greek *Church in the seven Sacraments*. As for the Heresie of the *Grecians*, that the Holy-Ghost proceeds not from the Son, I suppose, that Protestants disavow them in that error, as we do.

(i) *Pag.* 225.

(k) *De statu Eccles. Pag.* 253.

(l) *Pag.* 225.

49. D. *Potter* will not (I think) so much wrong his reputation, as to tell us, that the *Waldenses*, *Wicliffe*, *Huss*, or the like, were Protestants, because in some things they disagreed from Catholiques. For he well knows that the example of such men is subject to these manifest exceptions, They were not of all Ages, nor in all Countries, but confined to certain places, and were interrupted in Time, against the notion and nature of the word *Catholique*. They had no Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, nor Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Pastors. They differed among themselves, and from Protestants also. They agreed

agreed in divers things with us against Protestants. They held Doctrins manifestly absurd, and damnable heresies.

50. The *Waldenses* began not before the year 1218. so far were they from Universality of all Ages. For their Doctrin: first, they denyed all Judgments which extended to the drawing of bloud; and the Sabbath, for which cause they were called In-sabbatists. Secondly, they taught that Lay-men, and women might consecrate the Sacrament, and preach (no doubt but by this means to make their Master *Waldo*, a meer lay-man, capable of such functions.) Thirdly, that Clergy-men ought to have no possessions, or proprieties. Fourthly, that there should be no division of Parishes, nor Churches; for a walled Church they reputed as a Barn. Fifthly, that men ought not to take an Oath in any case. Sixthly, that those persons sinned mortally, who accompanyed without hope of issue. Seventhly, they held all things done above the girdle, by kissing, touching, words, compression of the breasts, &c. to be done in Charity, and not against Continency. Eighthly, that neither Priest, nor civil Magistrate, being guilty of mortal sin, did enjoy their dignity, or were to be obeyed. Ninthly, they condemned Princes and Judges. Tenthly, they affirmed singing in the Church to be an hellish clamor. Eleventhly, they taught that men might dissemble their Religion, and so accordingly they went to Catholique Churches, dissembling their Faith, and made Offertories, Confessions, and Communions, after a dissembling manner. *Waldo* was so *unlearned*, that (saith (m) *Fox*) he gave rewards to certain learned men to translate the holy Scripture for him, and being thus holpen did (as the same *Fox* there reporteth) *conferr the form of Religion in his time, to the infallible Word of God.* A goodly example, for such as must needs have the Scripture in *English*, to be read by every simple body, with such fruit of godly Doctrine, as we have seen in the foresaid gross heresies of *Waldo*. The followers of *Waldo*, were like their Master, so unlearned, that *some of them* (saith (n) *Fox*) *expounded the words, Joan. 1. Sui eum non receperunt: Swine did not receive him.* And to conclude, they agreed in divers things with Catholiques against Protestants, as may be seen in (o) *Brerely*.

(m) *Act. Mon. Pag. 628.*

(n) *Ibid.*

(o) *Tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. fund. 3.*

51. Neither can it be pretended, that these are slanders forged by Catholiques. For, besides that the same things are testified by Protestant writers, as *Illyricus*, *Cowper*, and others, our Authors cannot be suspected of partiality in disfavour of Protestants, unless you will say perhaps, that they were Prophets, and some hundred years ago, did both foresee that there were to be Protestants in the world, and that such Protestants were to be like the *Waldenses*. Besides, from whence, but from our Histories are Protestants come to know, that there were any such men as the *Waldenses*? and that in some Points they agreed with the Protestants, and disagreed from them in others? And upon what ground can they believe our Author for that part wherein the *Waldenses* were like to Protestants, and imagin they lyed in the rest?

52. Neither could *Wickliffe* continue a Church never interrupted from the time of the *Waldenses*, after whom he lived more than one hundred and fifty years; to wit, the year 1371. He agreed with Catholiques about the worshipping of Reliques and Images: and, about the Intercession of our blessed Lady, the ever Immaculate Mother of God, he went so far as to say, *It seems to me* (p) *impossible, that we should be rewarded without the intercession of the Virgin Mary.* He held seven Sacraments, Purgatory, and other Points. And against both Catholiques and Protestants he maintained sundry damnable Doctrins, as divers Protestant Writers relate. As first: If a Bishop, or Priest be in deadly sin, he doth not indeed either give Orders, Consecrate, or Baptize. Secondly, That Ecclesiastical Ministers ought not to have any temporal possessions, nor propriety in any thing, but should beg; and yet he himself brake into heresie, because he had been deprived by the Archbishop of *Canterbury* of a certain Benefice, as all Schisms, and Heresies begin upon passion, which they seek to cover with the cloak of Reformation. Thirdly, he condemned lawful Oaths, like the Anabaptists. Fourthly, he taught that all things came to pass by absolute necessity. Fifthly, he defended humane merits as the wicked *Pelagians* did, namely, as proceeding from natural forces, without the necessary help of Gods grace. Sixthly, that no man is a Civil Magistrate, while he is in mortal sin, and that the people may at their pleasure correct Princes, when they offend: by which Doctrin he proves himself both an Heretique, and a Traytour.

(p) *In serm. de Assump. Mariæ.*

53. As for *Huss*, his chiefest Doctrins were: That Lay people must receive in *both kinds*; and, That Civil Lords, Prelates, and Bishops lose all right, and authority, while they are in mortal sin. For other things he wholly agreed with Catholiques against Protestants; and the *Bohemians* his followers being demanded in what points they disagreed from the Church of *Rome*, propounded only these: *The necessity of Communion under both kinds*; That *all Civil Dominion was forbidden to the Clergie*; That *Preaching of the Word, was free for all men*, and in all *places*; That *open crimes were in no wise to be permitted, for avoiding of greater evil.* By these particulars, it is apparent that *Husse* agreed with Protestants against us, in one only Point of *both kinds*, which according to *Luther* is a thing indifferent; because he teacheth that *Christ in this matter* (q) *commanded nothing as necessary.* And he saith further: *If thou come to a place* (r) *where one only kind is administred, use one kind only, as others do.* *Melanthon* likewise holds it a thing (s) indifferent: and the same is the opinion of some other Protestants. All which considered, it is clear, that Protestants cannot challenge the *Waldenses*, *Wickliffe*, and *Husse* for members of their Church: and although they could, yet that would advantage them little towards the finding them out a perpetual visible Church of theirs, for the reasons above (t) specified.

(q) *In epist. ad Bohemos.*

(r) *De utraq; specie Sacram.*

(s) *In Cent. epist. Theol. pag. 225.*

(t) Numb. 49.

54. If D. *Potter* would go so far off, as to fetch the *Muscovites*, *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Æthiopians*, or *Abissines* into his Church, they would prove over dear bought: For they either hold the damnable Heresie of *Eutyches*, or use Circumcision, or agree with the *Greek*, or *Roman* Church: And it is most certain that they have nothing to do with the Doctrin of the Protestants.

55. It being therefore granted that Christ had a visible Church in all Ages, and that there can be none assigned but the Church of *Rome*; it follows, that she is the true Catholique Church; and that those pretended Corruptions for which they forsook her, are indeed divine truths, delivered by the visible Catholique Church of Christ: And that *Luther* and his followers departed from her, and consequently are guilty

guilty of *Schism*, bydividing themselves from the *Communion of the Roman Church*. Which is clearly convinced out of D. *Potter* himself, although the *Roman* Church were but a particular Church. For he saith: *whosoever professes* (u) *himself to forsake the Communion of any one member of the body of Christ; must confess himself consequently to forsake the whole.* Since therefore in the same place he expressly acknowledges the *Church of Rome to be a member of the body of Christ*, and that it is clear they have forsaken her; it evidently follows, that they have forsaken the *whole*, and therefore are most properly *Schismatiques*. (u) Pag. 67.

56. And lastly, since the crime of *Schism* is so grievous, that, according to the Doctrin of holy Fathers rehearsed above, no multitude of good works, no moral honesty of life, no cruel death endured even for the profession of some Article of Faith, can excuse any one who is guilty of that sin from damnation; I leave it to be considered, whether it be not true Charity to speak as we believe, and to believe as all Antiquity hath taught us, That whosoever either *begins*, or *continues*, a division from the *Roman Church*, which we have proved to be Christ's true *Militant* Church on earth, cannot without effectual repentance hope to be a member of his Triumphant Church in heaven. And so I conclude with these words of blessed S. *Augustine*: *It is common* (w) *to all Heretiques to be unable to see that thing which in the world is the most manifest, and placed in the light of all Nations: out of whose unity whatsoever they work, though they seem to do it with great care and diligence, can no more avail them against the wrath of God, than the Spider's web against the extremity of cold.* But now it is high time that we treat of the other sort of *Division* from the Church, which is by *Heresie*. (w) *Cont. Parm. lib. 2. c. 3.*

The ANSWER to the FIFTH CHAPTER.

The separation of Protestants from the Roman Church, being upon just and necessary causes, is not any way guilty of Schism.

1. AND §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. In the seven first Sections of this Chapter, there be many things said, and many things supposed by you which are untrue, and deserve a censure. As,

2. First, *That Schism could not be a Division from the Church, or that a Division from the Church could not happen, unless there always had been and should be a visible Church.* Which Assertion is a manifest falshood; For although there never had been any Church Visible or Invisible before this Age, nor should be ever after; yet this could not hinder, but that a Schism might now be, and be a Division from the present visible Church. As though in *France* there never had been until now a lawful Monarch, nor after him ever should be; yet this hinders not, but that now there might be a Rebellion, and that Rebellion might be an Insurrection against Soveraign Authority.

3. *That it is a point to be granted by all Christians, that in all Ages there hath been a visible Congregation of faithful people.* Which Proposition howsoever you understand it, is not absolutely certain. But if you mean by *Faithful*, (as it is plain you do) *free from all error in faith*, then you know all Protestants with one consent affirm it to be false; and therefore without proof to take it for granted is to beg the Question.

4. *That supposing* Luther *and they which did first separate from the Roman Church were guilty of Schism, it is certainly consequent, that all who persist in this Division must be so likewise.* Which is not so certain as you pretend. For they, which alter without necessary cause the present government of any State, Civil or Ecclesiastical, do commit a great fault; whereof notwithstanding they may be innocent who continue this alteration, and to the utmost of their power oppose a change though to the former State, when continuance of time hath once setled the present. Thus have I known some of your own Church, condemn the Low-countrey men who first revolted from the King of *Spain*, of the sin of Rebellion; yet absolve them from it

who

who now being of your Religion there, are yet faithful maintainers of the common liberty againſt the pretences of the King of *Spain*.

5. Fourthly, *That all thoſe which a Chriſtian is to eſteem neighbours do concur to make one company, which is the Church.* Which is falſe: for a Chriſtian is to eſteem thoſe his neighbours, who are not members of the true Church.

6. Fifthly, *That all the Members of the Viſible Church, are by charity united into one Myſtical body.* Which is manifeſtly untrue; for many of them have no Charity.

7. Sixthly, *That the Catholique Church ſignifies one company of faithful people,* which is repugnant to your own grounds. For you require, not true Faith, but only the Profeſſion of it, to make men members of the viſible Church.

8. Seventhly, *That every Heretique is a Schiſmatique.* Which you muſt acknowledge falſe in thoſe, who though they deny, or doubt of ſome Point profeſſed by your Church, and ſo are Heretiques; yet continue ſtill in the Communion of the Church.

9. Eighthly, *That all the Members of the Catholique Church, muſt of neceſſity be united in external Communion.* Which though it were much to be deſired it were ſo, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true. For a man unjuſtly excommmunicated, is not in the Churches Communion, yet he is ſtill a Member of the Church: and divers time it hath happened, as in the caſe of *Chryſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*, that particular men, and particular Churches, have upon an overvalued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them ſeparated from the other, and yet both have continued Members of the Catholique Church. Theſe things are in thoſe *ſeven Sections*, either ſaid or ſuppoſed by you untruly, without all ſhew, or pretence of proof. The reſt is impertinent common place, wherein Proteſtants and the cauſe in hand, are abſolutely unconcern'd. And therefore I paſs to the *eighth Section*.

10. *Ad §.* 8. Wherein you obtrude upon us a double Fallacy; One, in ſuppoſing and taking for granted, that whatſoever is affirmed by *three Fathers*, muſt be true; whereas your ſelves make no ſcruple of condemning many things of falſhood, which yet are maintained by more than thrice three Fathers. Another, in pretending their words to be ſpoken abſolutely, which by them are limited and reſtrained to ſome particular caſes. For whereas you ſay S. *Auſtin* c. 62. l. 2. *cont. Parm.* inferrs out of the former premiſes, *That there is no neceſsity to divide Unity*: to let paſs your want of diligence, in quoting the 62. Chapter of that Book, which hath but 23. in it: to paſs by alſo, that theſe words which are indeed in the 11. Chapter, are not inferred out of any ſuch premiſes as you pretend; this, I ſay, is evident, that he ſays not abſolutely, that there never is, or can be any neceſſity to divide Unity (which only were for your purpoſe,) but only in ſuch a ſpecial caſe, as he there ſets down: That is, *When good men tolerate bad men, which can do them no ſpiritual hurt, to the intent they may not be ſeparated from thoſe, who are ſpiritually good*; *Then* (ſaith he) *there is no neceſsity to divide Unity*. Which very words do clearly give us to underſtand, that it may fall out (as it doth in our caſe,) that we cannot keep Unity with bad men, without ſpiritual hurt, *i. e.* without partaking with them in their impieties, and that then there is a neceſſity to divide Unity from them:

I mean, to break off conjunction with them in their impieties. Which that it was S. *Austin*'s mind, it is most evident out of the 21. c. of the same Book: where, to *Parmenian* demanding, *How can a man remain pure, being joyned with those that are corrupted?* he answers, *Very true, this is not possible, if he be joyned with them, that is, if he commit any evil with them, or favour them which do commit it. But if he do neither of these, he is not joyned with them.* And presently after, *These two things retained, will keep such men pure and uncorrupted; that is, neither doing ill, nor approving it.* And therefore seeing you impose upon all men of your Communion, a necessity of *doing*, or at least *approving* many things unlawful, certainly there lies upon us an unavoidable necessity of dividing Unity, either with you, or with God; and whether of these is rather to be done, be ye Judges.

11. *Irenæus* also says not simply (which only would do you service,) there cannot possibly be any so important Reformation, as to justifie a separation from them who will not reform: But only, *they cannot make any corruption so great, as is the pernitiousness of a Schism*: Now, *They*, here, is a relative, and hath an antecedent expressed in *Irenæus*, which, if you had been pleased to take notice of, you would easily have seen, that what *Irenæus* says, falls heavy upon the Church of *Rome*, but toucheth Protestants nothing at all. For the men he speaks of, are such as *Propter modicas & quaslibet causas, for trifling or small causes, divide the body of Christ; such as speak of peace, and make war; such as strain at gnats and swallow Camels. And these*, saith he, *can make no reformation of any such importance, as to countervail the danger of a division.* Now, seeing the causes of our separation from the Church of *Rome*, are (as we pretend, and are ready to justifie,) because we will not be partakers with her in Superstition, Idolatry, Impiety, and most cruel Tyranny, both upon the bodies and souls of men, Who can say, that the causes of our separation, may be justly esteemed *Modicæ & quælibet causæ?* On the other side, seeing the Bishop of *Rome*, who was contemporary to *Irenæus*, did (as much as in him lay) cut off from the Churches unity, many great Churches, for not conforming to him in an indifferent matter, upon a difference, *Non de Catholico dogmate, sed de Ritu, vel Ritus potiùs tempore; Not about any Catholique doctrine, but only a Ceremony, or rather about the time of observing it?* so *Petavius* values it: which was just all one, as if the Church of *France* should excommunicate those of their own Religion in *England*, for not keeping Christmas upon the same day with them. And seeing he was reprehended sharply and bitterly for it, by most of the Bishops of the world, as *Eusebius* testifies, and (as Cardinal *Perron* though mincing the mattter, yet confesseth) by this very *Irenæus* himself in particular admonished, that for so small a cause (*propter tam modicam causam*,) he should not have cut off so many Provinces from the body of the Church: and lastly, seeing the Ecclesiastical Story of those times, mentions no other notable example of any such Schismatical presumption, but this of *Victor*; certainly we have great inducement to imagine, that *Irenæus* in this place by you quoted, had a special aim at the Bishop and Church of *Rome*. Once, this I am sure of, that the place fits him, and many of his successors, as well as if it had been made purposely for them. And this also, that he which finds fault with them *who separate upon small causes*, implies clearly, that he conceived, there might be such causes

Euseb. hist. l. 5. c. 24. Perron Replic. 3. l. 2. c.

as

as were great and ſufficient: And that then a Reformation was to be made, notwithſtanding any danger of diviſion that might enſue upon it.

12 Laſtly S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, ſays indeed and very well, *that all things ſhould be rather endured, than we ſhould conſent to the diviſion of the Church*: I would add Rather than conſent to the continuation of the diviſion, if it might be remedied. But then, I am to tell you, that he ſays not, All things ſhould rather *be done*, but only, All things ſhould rather *be endured or ſuffered*: wherein he ſpeaks not of the evil of Sin, but of Pain and Miſery: Not of tolerating either Error or Sin in others (though that may be lawful,) much leſs of joyning with others for quietneſs ſake, (which only were to your purpoſe) in the profeſſion of Error, and practice of Sin: but of ſuffering any affliction, nay even martyrdom in our own perſons, rather than conſent to the diviſion of the Church. *Omnia incommoda*, ſo your own *Chriſtopherſon*, enforced by the circumſtances of the place, tranſlates *Dionyſius* his words, All *miſeries ſhould rather be endured, than we ſhould conſent to the Churches diviſion.*

13. *Ad §.* 9. In the next Paragraph you affirm two things, but prove neither, unleſs a vehement Aſſeveration, may paſs for a weak proof. You tell us firſt, *That the Doctrin of the total deficiency of the viſible Church, which is maintained by divers chief Proteſtants, implies in it vaſt Abſurdity, or rather ſacrilegious Blaſphemy.* But neither do the Proteſtants, alledged by you, maintain the deficiency of the Viſible Church, but only of the Churches viſibility; or of the Church as it is Viſible, which ſo acute a man as you, now that you are minded of it, I hope, will eaſily diſtinguiſh: Neither do they hold, that the viſible Church hath failed totally and from its Eſſence, but only from its purity: and that it fell into many corruptions, but yet not to nothing. And yet if they had held, that there was not only no pure viſible Church, but none at all: ſurely they had ſaid more than they could juſtifie; but yet they do not ſhew, neither can I diſcover, any ſuch *Vaſt abſurdity or Sacrilegious Blaſphemy* in this Aſſertion. You ſay ſecondly, that the *Reaſon which caſt them upon this wicked Doctrin, was a deſperate voluntary neceſſity, becauſe they were reſolved not to acknowledge the Roman to be the true Church, and were convinced by all manner of evidence, that for divers Ages before* Luther *there was no other.* But this is not to diſpute but to divine, and take upon you the property of God which is to know the hearts of men. For why, I pray, might not the Reaſon hereof rather be, becauſe they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as Scripture, Reaſon, Antiquity, that all the viſible Churches in the world, but above all the Roman, had degenerated from the purity of the Goſpel of Chriſt, and thereupon did conclude there was no viſible Church, meaning by *no Church, none free from corruption*, and conformable in all things to the doctrin of Chriſt.

14 *Ad §.* 10. Neither is there anyr epugnance (but in words only) between theſe as you are pleaſed to ſtile them *exterminating Spirits*, & thoſe other, whom out of Courteſie you intitle, in your 10. *§. more moderate Proteſtants.* For theſe affirming the Perpetual Viſibility of the Church, yet neither deny, nor doubt of her being ſubject to manifold and grievous corruptions, and thoſe, of ſuch a nature, as, were they not mitigated by invincible, or at leaſt a very probable ignorance, none ſubject to them could be ſaved. And they, on the other ſide, denying the Churches Viſibility, yet plainly affirm, that they conceive very good hope of the Salvation of many, of their ignorant and

and honeſt Fore fathers. Thus declaring plainly, though in words they denyed the Viſibility of the true Church, yet their meaning was not to deny the perpetuity, but the perpetual purity & incorruption of the Viſible Church.

15. *Ad §.* 11. Let us proceed therefore to your 11. Section, where though D. *Potter* and other Proteſtants granting the Churches perpetual Viſibility, make it needleſs for you to prove it, yet you will needs be doing that which is needleſs. But you do it ſo coldly and negligently, that it is very happy for you, that D. *Potter* did grant it.

16. For, *What if the Prophets ſpake more obſcurely of Chriſt, than of the Church? What if they had fore-ſeen, that greater contentions would ariſe about the Church than Chriſt?* Which yet, he that is not a meer ſtranger in the ſtory of the Church muſt needs know to be untrue, and therefore not to be fore-ſeen by the Prophets. What *if we have manifeſtly received the Church from the Scriptures?* Does it follow from any, or all theſe things, that the Church of Chriſt muſt be always viſible?

17. Beſides, What Proteſtant ever granted (that which you preſume upon ſo confidently,) that *every man for all the affairs of his ſoul muſt have recourſe to ſome Congregation?* If ſome one Chriſtan lived alone among Pagans in ſome Countrey, remote from Chriſtendom, ſhall we conceive it impoſſible for this man to be ſaved, becauſe he cannot have recourſe to any Congregation, for the affairs of his ſoul? will it not be ſufficient, for ſuch a ones ſalvation, to know the doctrin of Chriſt, and live according to it? Such fancies as theſe, you do very wiſely to take for granted, becauſe you know well, 'tis hard to prove them.

18. Let it *be as unlawful as you pleaſe, to deny and diſſemble matters of faith. Let them that do ſo, not be a Church, but a damned crew of Sycophants:* What is this to the Viſibility of the Church? May not the Church be Inviſible, and yet theſe that are of it profeſs their faith? No, ſay you: Their profeſſion will make them viſible. Very true, viſible in the places where, and in the times when they live, and to thoſe perſons, unto whom they have neceſſary occaſion, to make their profeſſion: But not viſible to all, or any great, or conſiderable part of the world while they live, much leſs conſpicuous to all ages after them. Now it is a Church thus illuſtriouſly and conſpicuouſly viſible that you require: by whoſe ſplendour all men may be directed and drawn to repair to her, for the affairs of their ſouls: Neither is it the Viſibility of the Church abſolutely, but this degree of it, which the moſt rigid Proteſtants deny: which is plain enough out of the places of *Napper*, cited by you in your 9th Part of this Chapter. Where his words are, *God hath withdrawn his viſible Church from open Aſſemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men.* And this Church which had not open Aſſemblies, he calls *The Latent and Inviſible Church.* Now, I hope, Papiſts in *England* will be very apt to grant, men may be ſo farr Latent and Inviſible, as not to profeſs their faith in open Aſſemblies, nor to proclaim it to the world, and yet not deny, nor diſſemble it; nor deſerve to be eſteemed a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants.*

19. But, *Preaching of the word, and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, cannot but make a Church viſible: and theſe are inſeparable notes of the Church.* I anſwer, they are ſo far inſeparable, that whereſoever they are, there a Church is: But not ſo, but that in ſome caſes there may be a Church, where theſe notes are not. Again, theſe notes will make the Church viſible:

But to whom? Certainly not to all men, nor to most men: But to them only to whom the Word is preached, and the Sacraments are administred. They make the Church visible, to whom themselves are visible, but not to others. As where your Sacraments are administred, and your Doctrin preached, it is visible, that there is a Popish Church. But this may perhaps be visible to them only, who are present at these performances, and to others as secret, as if they had never been performed.

20. But *S.* Austin *saith, It is an impudent, abominable, detestable speech, &c. to say, The Church hath perished.* I answer; 1. All that *S. Austin* says, is not true. 2. Though this were true, it were nothing to your purpose, unless you will conceive it all one, not to be, and not to be conspicuously visible. 3. This very speech that the Church perished, might be false and impudent in the *Donatists*, and yet not so in the Protestants. For there is no incongruity, that what hath lived 500 years, may perish in 16[illegible]. But *S.* Austin *denyed not only the actual perishing*, but *the possibility of it, and not only of its falling* to nothing, *but of its falling into corruption.* I answer: though no such thing appears out of those places, yet, I believe, heat of disputation against the *Donatists*, and a desire to over-confute them, transported him so far, as to urge against them more than was necessary, and perhaps more than was true. But were he now revived, and did but confront the doctrin of after-ages, with that; his own experience would enforce him to change his opinion. As concerning the last speech of *S. Austin*, I cannot but wonder very much, why he should think it absurd for any man to say, *There are sheep which he knows not, but God knows:* and no less at you, for obtruding this sentence upon us as pertinent proof of the Churches visibility.

21. Neither do I see, *how the Truth of any present Church depends upon the Perpetual Visibility, nay nor upon the perpetuity* of that which is past or future. For what sense is there, that it should not be in the power of God Almighty, to restore to a flourishing estate, a Church which oppression hath made Invisible? to repair that which is ruined; to reform that which was corrupted, or to revive that which was dead? Nay, what Reason is there, but that by ordinary means this may be done, so long as the Scriptures by Divine Providence are preserved in their Integrity and Authority? As a Common-wealth though never so far collapsed and over-run with disorders, is yet in possibility of being reduc'd unto its Original state, so long as the Ancient Laws, and Fundamental Constitutions are extant, and remain inviolate, from whence men may be directed how to make such a Reformation. *But S. Austine urges this very Argument against the Donatists, and therefore it is good.* I answer, that I doubt much of the Consequence, and my Reason is, because you your selves acknowledge, that even General Councils (and therefore much more particular Doctors) though infallible in their determinations, are yet in their Reasons and Arguments, whereupon they ground them, subject to like Passions and Errors with other men.

22. Lastly, whereas you say, *That all Divines define Schism, A Division from the true Church*, and from thence collect, That *there must be a known Church from which it is possible for men to depart:* I might very justly question your Antecedent, and desire you to consider, whether Schism be not rather, or at least be not as well a division of the Church, as from it? A separation not of a part from the whole, but of some parts from the other. And if you liked not this definition, I might desire you to inform me in those many

Schisms,

Schisms, which have hapned in the Church of *Rome*, which of the parts was the Church, and which was divided from it. But to let this pass, certainly your consequence is most unreasonable. For though whensoever there is a Schism, it must necessarily suppose a Church existent there, yet sure we may define a Schism that is, declare what the word signifies (for Defining is no more) though at this present there were neither Schism nor Church in the world. Unless you will say, that we cannot tell what a Rose is, or what the word Rose signifies, but only in the Summer when we have Roses: or that in the world to come, when men shall not marry, it is impossible to know, what it is to marry: or that the Plague is not a disease, but only when some body is infected: or that Adultery is not a sin, unless there be Adulterers: or that before *Adam* had a Child, he knew not, and God could not have told him, what it was to be a Father. Certainly Sir, you have forgot your Metaphysicks, which you so much glory in, if you know not, that the connexions of essential predicates with their subjects, are eternal, and depend not at all upon the actual existence of the thing defined. This definition therefore of Schism, concludes not the existence of a Church, even when it is defined: much less the perpetual continuance of it, and least of all the continuance of it in perpetual visibility and purity, which is the only thing that we deny, & you are to prove. By this time, you perceive I hope, that I had reason to say, that it was well for you, that D. *Potter* granted the Churches perpetual Visibility: for, for ought I can perceive, this Concession of his, is the best stake in your hedge, the best piller upon which this conclusion stands; which yet is the only ground-work of your whole Accusation.

23. *Ad* § 12. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. The remainder of this Chapter, to convince *Luther*, and all that follow him to be Schismatiques, affords us Arguments of two sorts: the first drawn from the nature of the thing: the second from D. *Potters* words and acknowledgements. So that the former if they be good must be good against all Protestants: the later only against D. *Potter*. I will examin them all, and doubt not to make it appear even to your self, if you have any indifference, that there is not any sound and concluding reason amongst them, but that they are all poor and miserable Sophisms.

24 First then to prove us Schismatiques, you urge from the nature of Schism this only Argument.

Whosoever leave the external Communion of the visible Church, are Schismatiques: But Luther *and his followers left the external Communion of the visible Church of Christ. Therefore they are Schismatiques.*

The Major of this Syllogism you leave naked without proof; and conceive it, as it should seem, able enough to shift for it self. The Minor or second Proposition of this Argument, you prove by two other. The first is this.

They which forsook the external Communion of all visible Churches, must needs forsake the external Communion of the true visible Church of Christ: But Luther *and his followers forsook the external Communion of all visible Churches: Therefore they forsook the external Communion of the true visible Church.*

The *Major* of this Syllogism you take for granted (as you have reason:) The *Minor* you prosecute with great pomp of words, and prove with plenty of Reasons, built upon the confessions of D. *Potter*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and other Protestants; and this you do in the 12 § of this Chapter.

The ſecond Argument to prove the Aſſumption of your Syllogiſm, ſtands thus.

The Roman *Church, when* Luther *and his followers made the ſeparation, was the true viſible Church of Chriſt: But* Luther *and his followers forſook the external Communion of the* Roman *Church: Therefore they forſook the external Communion of the true viſible Church of Chriſt.*

The Aſſumption of this Syllogiſm needs no proof: the Propoſition which needs it very much, you endeavour to confirm by theſe Reaſons.

1. *The* Roman *Church had the notes of the Church aſſigned by Proteſtants.* i.e. *The true Preaching of the Word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments: Therefore ſhe was the true Church.*

The Antecedent is proved: *Becauſe D.* Potter *confeſſes ſhe wanted nothing Fundamental or neceſſary to ſalvation: Therefore for the Subſtance of the matter ſhe had theſe notes.*

2. *Either the* Roman *Church was the true viſible Church, or Proteſtants can name and prove ſome other, diſagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with Proteſtants, in their particular Doctrins; or elſe they muſt ſay, There was no viſible Church: But they will not ſay, There was no Church: They cannot name and prove any other diſagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with Proteſtants, in their particular Doctrins: becauſe this cannot be the* Greek *Church, nor that of the* Waldenſes, Wickliſites, Huſſites, *nor that of the* Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Æthiopians, *which you confirm by ſeveral Arguments: Therefore they muſt grant, that the* Roman *Church was the true viſible Church.*

And this is the buſineſs of your 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55. Sections of this Chapter.

25. Now to all this, I anſwer very briefly thus: That you have played the unwiſe builder, and erected a ſtately ſtructure upon a falſe foundation. For whereas you take for granted as an undoubted Truth, *That whoſoever leave the external communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmatical,* I tell you Sir, you preſume too much upon us, and would have us grant, that which is the main point in Queſtion. For either you ſuppoſe the external Communion of the Church corrupted, and that there was a neceſſity for them that would communicate with this Church to communicate in her corruptions: Or you ſuppoſe her Communion uncorrupted. If the former, and yet will take for granted, that all Schiſmatiques, that leave her Communion though it be corrupted, you beg the Queſtion in your Propoſition. If the later, you beg the Queſtion in your ſuppoſition; for Proteſtants, you know, are Peremptory and Unanimous in the Denial of both theſe things: Both that the Communion of the Viſible Church was then uncorrupted; And that they are truly Schiſmatiques, who leave the Communion of the Viſible Church, if corrupted; eſpecially, if the caſe be ſo (and *Luther*'s was ſo) that they muſt either leave her Communion, or of neceſſity Communicate with her in her corruptions. You will ſay perhaps, *That you have already proved it impoſſible, that the Church, or her Communion ſhould be corrupted.* And therefore that they are Schiſmatiques, who leave the external Communion of the viſible Church, becauſe ſhe cannot be corrupted. And that *hereafter you will prove, that corruption in the Churches Communion, though the belief & profeſſion of them be made the condition of her communion, cannot juſtifie a ſeparation from it:* & therefore that they are ſchiſmaticks, who leave the Churches communion

munion though corrupted. I answer, that I have examined your proofs of the former, and found that a vein of Sophistry runs clean through them: And for the later it is so plain and palpable a falsehood, that I cannot but be confident, whatsoever you bring in proof of it, will, like the Apples of *Sodom*, fall to Ashes upon the first touch. And this is my first and main exception against your former discourse: that accusing Protestants of a very great and horrible crime, you have proved your accusation only with a Fallacy.

26. Another is, that although it were granted Schism, to leave the external Communion of the visible Church in what state or case so ever it be, and that *Luther* and his followers were Schismatiques, for leaving the external Communion of all visible Churches: yet you fail exceedingly of clearing the other necessary point undertaken by you, *That the Roman Church was then the Visible Church.* For neither do *Protestants* (as you mistake) *make the true preaching of the Word, and due administration of the Sacraments, the notes of the visible Church,* but only of a visible Church: now these you know are very different things, the former signifying *the Church Catholique*, or the whole Church: the later a *Particular Church*, or a part of the Catholique. And therefore, suppose out of curtesie, we should grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church had these notes, yet would it by no means follow, that your Church were *the Visible Church*, but only a *Visible Church*: not the whole Catholique, but only a part of it. But then besides, where doth D. *Potter* acknowledge any such matter as you pretend? Where doth he say, that you had for the substance, *the true Preaching of the Word*, or *due Administration of the Sacraments?* Or where does he say, that (from which you collect this) *you wanted nothing Fundamental, or necessary to Salvation?* He says indeed, that though your *Errors were in themselves damnable, and full of great impiety, yet he hopes, that those amongst you, who were invincibly ignorant of the truth, might by Gods great mercy, have their errors pardoned, and their souls saved:* And this is all he says, and this you confess to be all he says, in divers places of your Book: which is no more than you your self do, and must affirm of Protestants: and yet I believe, you will not suffer us to inferr from hence, that you grant Protestants to have, for the substance, the true preaching of the Word, and due administration of the Sacraments, and want nothing fundamental, or necessary to salvation. And if we should draw this consequence from your concession, certainly we should do you injury, in regard many things may in themselves, and in ordinary course be necessary to salvation, to those that have means to attain them, as your Church generally hath: which yet, by accident, to these which were, by some impregnable impediment, debarred of these means, may by Gods mercy be made unnecessary.

27. Lastly, whereas *you say, that Protestants must either grant that your Church then was the visible Church, or name some other, disagreeing from yours and agreeing with Protestants in their particular doctrin, or acknowledge there was no visible Church.* It is all one, as if (to use S. *Paul*'s similitude) the head should say to the foot, Either you must grant that I am the whole body, or name some other member that is so, or confess that there is no body. To which the foot may answer; I acknowledge there is a body: and yet, that no member beside you is this body: nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner say we, We acknowledge a Church there was, corrupted indeed universally; but yet such a one as we hope by Gods gracious

acceptance, was still a Church. We pretend not to name any one Society that was this Church; and yet we see no reason, that can inforce us to confess that yours was the Church, but only a part of it, and that one of the worst then extant in the World. In vain therefore have you troubled your self in proving, that we *cannot pretend, that either the Greeks, Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, Muscovites, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssines, were then the visible Church.* For all this discourse proceeds upon a false and vain supposition, and begs another point in Question between us; which is, that *some Church of one denomination and one Communion* (as the *Roman*, the *Greek*, &c.) *must be always* exclusively to all other Communions, *the whole visible Church.* And though, perhaps some weak Protestant having this false principle setled in him, that there was to be always some Visible Church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrin, might be wrought upon, & prevailed with by it, to forsake the *Church* of Protestants: yet why it should induce him to go to yours, rather than the *Greek* Church, or any other, which pretends to perpetual succession as well as yours, that I do not understand; unless it be for the reason which *Æneus Sylvius* gave, why more held the Pope above a Council, than a Council above the Pope: which was because *Popes did give Bishopricks and Archbishopricks, but Councils gave none*, and therefore suing in *Forma Pauperis*, were not like to have their cause very well maintained. For put the case, I should grant of meer favour, that there must be always some Church of one Denomination and Communion, free from all errours in doctrin, and that Protestants had not always such a Church: it would follow indeed from thence, that I must not be a Protestant: But that I must be a Papist, certainly it would follow by no better consequence than this; If you will leave *England*, you must of necessity go to *Rome*. And yet with this wretched Fallacy, have I been sometimes abused my self, and known many other poor souls seduced, not only from their own Church, and Religion, but unto yours. I beseech God to open the eyes of all that love the truth, that they may not always be held captive, under such miserable delusions.

28. We see then, how unsuccessful you have been in making good your accusation, with reasons drawn from the nature of the thing, and which may be urged in common against all Protestants. Let us come now to the Arguments of the other kind, which you build upon D. *Potter*'s own words, out of which you promise unanswerable reasons to convince Protestants of Schism.

29. But let the understanding Reader, take with him but three or four short Remembrances, and I dare say he shall find them upon examination, not only answerable, but already answered. The Memorandums I would commend to him, are these,

30. 1. That not every separation, but only a causeless separation from the external Communion of any Church, is the Sin of Schism.

31. 2. That, Imposing upon men under pain of Excommunication a necessity of professing known errours, and practising known corruptions, is a sufficient and necessary cause of separation: and that this is the cause which Protestants alleage to justifie their separation from the Church of *Rome*.

32. 3. That to leave the Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, at least as D. *Potter* understands the words, is not the same thing: That being done, by ceasing to be a member of it, by ceasing to have

have those requisites which constitute a man a member of it, as faith and Obedience: This, by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publike worship of God. This little Armour if it be rightly placed, I am perswaded, will repel all those Batteries which you threaten shall be so furious.

33. *Ad* § 13, 14, 15. The first is a sentence of S. *Austine* against *Donatus*, applyed to *Luther* thus. *If the Church perished, what Church brought forth Donatus*, (you say Luther)? *If she could not perish, what madness moved the sect of Donatus to separate, upon pretence to avoyd the Communion of bad men?* Whereunto, one fair answer (to let pass many others) is obvious out of the second observation: That this sentence though it were Gospel, as it is not, is impertinently applyed to *Luther* and *Lutherans*, whose pretence of separation (be it true, or be it false,) was not (as that of the *Donatists*) only to avoid the Communion of bad men: but to free themselves from a necessity (which but by separating was unavoidable,) of joyning with bad men in their impieties. And your not substituting *Luther* instead of *Donatus* in the later part of the Dilemma as well as in the former, would make a suspicious man conjecture that you your self took notice of this exception of disparity between *Donatus* and *Luther*.

34. *Ad* § 16. Your second onset drives only at those Protestants, who *hold the true Church was invisible for many ages*. Which Doctrin (if by the *true Church* be understood, *the pure Church*, as you do understand it) is a certain truth, and it is easier for you to declaim (as you do) than to dispute against it. But *these men you say must be Heretiques, because they separated from the Communion of the visible Church: and therefore also from the Communion of that which they say was invisible: In as much as the invisible Church communicated with the visible.*

35. *Answ.* I might very justly desire some proof of that which so confidently you take for granted: That, there were no persecuted and oppressed maintainers of the Truth in the days of our Fore-fathers, but only such as dissembled their opinions, and lived in your Communion. And truly if I should say, there were many of this condition, I suppose, I could make my Affirmative much more probable, than you can make your Negative. We read in Scripture, that *Elias* conceived *There was none left beside himself in the whole Kingdom of Israel*, who had not revolted from God: and yet God himself assures us that he was deceived. And if such a man, a Prophet, and one of the greatest, erred in his judgment touching his own time, and his own countrey, why may not you, who are certainly but a man, and subject to the same passions as *Elias* was, mistake in thinking, that in former ages, in some countrey or other, there were not always some good Christians, which did not so much as externally bow their knees to your *Baal*? But this answer I am content you shall take no notice of, and think it sufficient to tell you, that if it be true, that this supposed invisible Church did hypocritically communicate with the visible Church, in her corruptions, then Protestants had cause, nay, necessity, to forsake their Communion also; for otherwise they must have joyn'd with them in the practise of impieties: and seeing they had such cause to separate, they presume their separation cannot be schismatical.

36. Yes, you reply, *To forsake the external Communion of them with whom they agree in faith, is the most formal and proper sin of Schism.*

Answ.

Anſw. Very true, but I would fain know, *wherein*. I would gladly be informed, whether I be bound, for fear of Schiſm, to communicate with thoſe that believe as I do, only in lawful things, or abſolutely in every thing: whether I am to joyn with them in ſuperſtition and Idolatry, and not only in a common profeſſion of the faith wherein we agree, but in a common diſſimulation or abjuration of it. This is that which you would have them do, or elſe, forſooth, they muſt be Schiſmatiques. But hereafter, I pray you remember, that there is no neceſſity of communicating even with true Believers in wicked actions. Nay, that there is a neceſſity herein to ſeparate from them. And then I dare ſay, even you being their judge, the reaſonableneſs of their cauſe to ſeparate ſhall, according to my firſt obſervation, juſtifie their ſeparation from being ſchiſmatical.

37. Arg. *But the property of Schiſm, according to D.* Potter, *is to cut off from the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates: And theſe Proteſtants have this property, Therefore they are Schiſmatiques.*

38. Anſ. I deny the Syllogiſm, it is no better than this:

One Symptom of the Plague is a Feaver,
But ſuch a man hath a Feaver,
Therefore he hath the Plague.

The true Concluſion which iſſues out of theſe Premiſſes, ſhould be this, Therefore he hath one Symptom of the Plague. And ſo likewiſe in the former, Therefore they have one property or one quality of Schiſmatiques. And as in the former inſtance, The man that hath one ſign of the Plague, may by reaſon of the abſence of other requiſites, not have the plague: So theſe Proteſtants may have ſomething of Schiſmatiques, and yet not be Schiſmatiques. A Tyrant ſentencing a man to death for his pleaſure, and a juſt judge that condemns a malefactor, do both ſentence a man to death, and ſo for the matter do both the ſame thing: yet the one does wickedly, the other juſtly. What's the reaſon? becauſe the one hath cauſe, the other hath not. In like manner Schiſmatiques, either always or generally denounce damnation to them from whom they ſeparate. The ſame do theſe Proteſtants, and yet are not Schiſmatiques. The reaſon: becauſe Schiſmatiques do it, and do it without cauſe, and Proteſtants have cauſe for what they do. The impieties of your Church, being, generally ſpeaking, damnable; unleſs where they are excus'd by ignorance, and expiated at leaſt by a general repentance. In fine, though perhaps it may be true, that all Schiſmatiques do ſo; yet univerſal affirmatives are not converted, and therefore it follows not by any good Logick, that all that do ſo, when there is juſt cauſe for it, muſt be Schiſmatiques. The cauſe in this matter of ſeparation is all in all, and that for ought I ſee, you never think of. But *if theſe rigid Proteſtants have juſt cauſe to cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation: How can the milder ſort allow hope of Salvation to the Members of this Church?* Anſ. Diſtinguiſh the quality of the Perſons cenſur'd, and this ſeeming repugnance of their cenſures will vaniſh into nothing. For your Church may be conſidered either in regard of thoſe, in whom, either negligence, or pride, or worldly fear, or hopes, or ſome other voluntary ſin, is the cauſe of their ignorance, which I fear is the caſe of the generality of men amongſt you: or in regard of thoſe who owe their Errours from Truth, to want of capacity, or default of inſtruction; either in reſpect of thoſe that might know the truth and will not, or of thoſe who would know the truth, but (all things

things considered) cannot: In respect of those that have eyes to see, and will not see; or those that would gladly see, but want eyes, or light. Consider the former sort of men, (which your more rigid censures seem especially to reflect upon,) and the heaviest sentence will not be too heavy. Consider the later, and the mildest will not be too mild. So that here is no difference but in words only, neither are you flatter'd by the one, nor uncharitably censur'd by the other.

39. Your next blow is directed against the milder sort of Protestants, *who (you say) involve themselves in the sin of Schism by communicating with those (as you call them) exterminating Spirits, whom you conceive your self to have proved Schismatiques:* And now load them further with the crime of Heresie. For, say you, *If you held your selves obliged under pain of damnation, to forsake the Communion of the Roman-Church by reason of her Errours, which yet you confess were not fundamental: shall it not be much more damnable, to live in confraternity with these, who defend an Errour of the failing of the Church, which in the* Donatists *you confess to have been properly Heretical?*

40. *Answ.* You mistake, in thinking that Protestants hold themselves obliged not to communicate with you, only or principally by reason of your Errours and Corruption. For the true reason according to my third Observation, is not so much because you *maintain* Errours and Corruption, as because you *impose* them: and will allow your Communion to none but to those that will hold them with you; and have so ordered your Communion, that either we must communicate with you in these things, or nothing. And for this very reason, though it were granted, that these Protestants held this Doctrin which you impute to them; And though this Errour were as damnable, and as much against the Creed as you pretend: Yet, after all this, this parity between you and them, might make it more lawful for us to communicate with them than you: because what they hold, they hold to themselves, and refuse not (as you do) to communicate with them that hold the contrary.

41. Thus we may answer your Argument, though both your former Suppositions were granted. But then for a second answer, I am to tell you, that there is no necessity of granting either of them. For neither do these Protestants hold the failing of the Church from its being, but only from its visibility: which if you conceive all one, then must you conceive that the Stars fail every day, and the Sun every night. Neither is it certain that the doctrin of the Churches failing is repugnant to the Creed. For as the truth of the Article of the remission of sins, depends not upon the actual remission of any mans sins, but upon Gods readiness and resolution to forgive the sins of all that believe and repent; so that although unbelief or impenitence should be universal, and *the Faithful should* absolutely *fail from the children of men*, and *the Son of Man should find no faith on the earth*; yet should the Article still continue true, that God would forgive the sins of all that repent. In like manner: It is not certain that the truth of the Article of the Catholique Church, depends upon the actual existence of a Catholique Church; but rather upon the right, that the Church of Christ, or rather (to speak properly) the Gospel of Christ hath to be universally believed. And therefore the Article may be true, though there were no Church in the world. In regard, this notwithstanding, it remains still true, that there ought to

be

be a Church, and this Church ought to be Catholique. For as, of theſe two Propoſitions, There is a Church in *America*, and, There ſhould be a Church in *America*, the truth of the later depends not upon truth of the former, ſo neither does it in theſe two: There is a Church diffuſed all the world over, and, There ſhould be a Church diffuſed all the world over.

42. Thirdly, if you underſtand by errors *not fundamental*, ſuch as are *not damnable*, it is not true, as I have often told you, that we confeſs your errors not fundamental.

43. Laſtly, for your deſire that I ſhould here apply an authority of St. *Cyprian* alleaged in your next number I would have done ſo very willingly, but indeed I know not how to do it: for in my apprehenſion it hath no more to do with your preſent buſineſs of proving it unlawful, to communicate with theſe men, who hold the Church was not alwayes viſible, than *In nova fert animus*. Beſides, I am here again to remember you, that St. *Cyprians* words, were they never ſo pertinent, yet are by neither of the parts litigant eſteemed any *rule of faith*. And therefore the urging of them, and ſuch like authorities, ſerves only to make Books great, and Controverſies endleſs.

44. *Ad §* 17. The next Section in three long leaves, delivers us this ſhort ſenſe. *That thoſe Proteſtants which ſay they have not left the Churches external Communion, but only her corruptions, pretend to do that which is impoßible. Becauſe theſe corruptions were inherent in the Churches external Communion: and therefore he that forſakes them, cannot but forſake this.*

45. Anſ. But, Who are they that pretend, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her external communion? Some there be that ſay, they have not left the Church, that is, not ceaſed to be members of the Church, but only left her corruptions: ſome, that they have not left the communion, but the corruptions of it; meaning the internal communion of it, and conjunction with it, by faith and obedience: which diſagree from the former only in the maner of ſpeaking: for he that is in the Church, is in this kind of communion with it: and he that is not in this internal communion, is not in the Church. Some perhaps, that they left not your external communion in all things; meaning, that they left it not voluntarily being not *fugitivi* but *fugati*, as being willing to joyn with you in any act of piety; but were by you neceſſitated and conſtrained to do ſo, becauſe you would not ſuffer them to do well with you, unleſs they would do ill with you. Now to do ill that you may do well, is againſt the will of God, which to every good man is a high degree of neceſſity. But for ſuch Proteſtants, as pretend that, *de facto, they forſook your corruptions only and not your external communion*, that is, ſuch as pretend to communicate with you in your Confeſſions and Liturgies, and participation of Sacraments; I cannot but doubt very much, that neither you, nor I, have ever met with any of this condition. And if perhaps you were led into error, by thinking that to leave the Church, and to leave the external communion of it, was all one in ſenſe and ſignification, I hope by this time you are diſabus'd and begin to underſtand, that as a man may leave any faſhion or cuſtome of a Colledge, and yet remain ſtill a member of the Colledge; ſo a man may poſſibly leave ſome opinion or practice of a Church, formerly common to himſelf and others, and continue ſtill a member of that Church: Provided that what he forſakes be not one of thoſe things, wherin the eſſence of the Church conſiſts. Wheras peradventure

Caſaubon. in Ep. ad Card. Perron.

adventure this practise may be so involved with the external communion of this Church, that it may be simply impossible, for him to leave this practise, and not to leave the Churches external communion.

46 You will reply perhaps, *That the difficulty lies as well against those who pretend to forsake the Churches corruptions and not the Church, as against those who say, they forsook the Churches corruptions and not her external communion. And that the reason is still the same: because these supposed corruptions, were inherent in the whole Church, and therefore, by like reason with the former, could not be forsaken, but if the whole Church were forsaken.*

47. Ans. A pretty Sophism, aud very fit to perswade men that it is impossible for them, to forsake any error they hold, or any vice they are subject to, either peculiar to themselves, or in common with others: Because, forsooth, they cannot forsake Themselves; and Vices and Errors are things inherent in themselves. The deceit lies, in not distinguishing between a Local and a Moral forsaking of any thing. For as it were an absurdity, fit for the maintainers of Transubstantiation to defend, that a man may Locally and properly depart from the Accidents of a subject, and not from the subject it self: So is it also against reason to deny, that a man may (by an usual phrase of speech) forsake any custom or quality, good or bad, either proper to himself, or common to himself with any company, and yet never truly or properly forsake either his company or himself. Thus if all the Jesuits in the Society, were given to write Sophistically, yet you might leave this ill custom, and yet not leave your Society. If all the Citizens of a City, were addicted to any vanity, they might, either all, or some of them, forsake it, and yet not forsake the City. If all the parts of a mans body were dirty or filthy, nothing hinders but that all or some of them might clense themselves, and yet continue parts of the body. And what reason then in the world is there, if the whole Visible Church were over-run with tares and weeds of superstitions, and corruptions, but that some members of it might reform themselves, and yet continue still true members of the body of the Church, and not be made no members, but the better by their Reformation? Certainly it is so obvious and sensible a Truth, that this thing is possible, that no man in his wits, will be perswaded out of it, with all the Quirks & Metaphysicks in the world. Neither is this to say, *that a man may keep company with* Christopher Potter, *and not keep company with the* Provost of Qu. Colledge: *Nor that a man can avoid the company of a sinner, and at the same time be really present with the man who is the sinner:* which we leave to those Protestants of your invention, who are so fooliish, as to pretend, that a man may really separate himself from the Churches external Communion as she is corrupted, and yet continue in that Churches external Communion, which in this external Communion is corrupted. But we, that say only the whole Church being corrupted, some parts of it might and did reform themselves, and yet might and did continue parts of the Church, though separated from the external communion of the other parts, which would not reform, need not trouble our selves to reconcile any such repugnance. For the case put by you, of keeping D. *Potters* company, and leaving the company of the *Provost of Queens Colledge*; and of leaving a sinners company, and not the mans: are nothing at all like ours. But if you would speak to the point, you must shew, that D. *Potter* cannot leave being *Provost of Q. Colledge*, without ceasing to be himself: or, that a sinner cannot leave his sin,

without

without ceaſing to be a man: or that he that is part of any ſociety, cannot renounce any Vice of that ſociety, but he muſt relinquiſh the ſociety. If you would ſhew any of theſe things, then indeed (I dare promiſe) you ſhall find us apt enough to believe, that the particular parts of the viſible Church could not reform themſelves, but they muſt of neceſſity become no parts of it. But until we ſee this done, you muſt pardon us, if we chooſe to believe ſenſe rather than Sophiſtry.

48. In this Paragraph you bring in the ſentence of S. *Cyprian*, whereto you refer'd us in the former: but, Why, in a controverſie of faith, do you cite any thing, which is confeſſed on all hands, not to be a rule of faith? Beſides, in my apprehenſion, this ſentence of S. *Cyprian*, is, in this place, and to this purpoſe, meerly impertinent. S. *Cyprians* words are, *The Church* (he ſpeaks of the particular Church, or Dioceſs of *Rome*) *being one, cannot be within and without: If ſhe be with* Novatianus, *ſhe was not with* Cornelius: *But if ſhe were with* Cornelius *who ſucceeded* Fabianus *by lawful Ordination*, Novatianus *is not in the Church*. And now, having related the words, I am only to remember the Reader, that your buſineſs was to prove it *impoßible*, *For a man to forſake the Churches corruptions and not the Church*, and to requeſt him to tell me Whether, as I ſaid, *In nova fert animus*, had not been as much to the purpoſe?

49. Toward the concluſion of this Section, you *number up your Victories and tell us, That out of your diſcourſe it remaineth cleer, that this our chiefeſt Anſwer changeth the very ſtate of the Queſtion: confoundeth internal Acts of the underſtanding, with external deeds: doth not diſtinguiſh between Schiſm and Hereſie, and leaves this demonſtrated againſt us, that they* (*Proteſtants*) *divided themſelves from the communion of the Viſible Catholique Church, becauſe they conceived that ſhe needed Reformation*. To which Triumphs, if any reply be needful, then briefly thus: We do not change the ſtate of the Queſtion, but you miſtake it. For the Queſtion was not, Whether they might forſake the corruptions of the Church, and continue in her external communion, which we confeſs impoſſible, becauſe theſe corruptions were in her communion: But the Queſtion was, Whether they might forſake the corruptions of the Church, and not the Church, but continue ſtill the members of it. And to this Queſtion, there is not in your whole diſcourſe one pertinent ſyllable.

50. We *do not confound internal Acts of underſtanding with external deeds*, but acknowledge (as you would have us) that *we cannot* (as matters now ſtand) *ſeparate from your corruptions, but we muſt depart from your External communion*. For you have ſo ordered things, that whoſoever will Communicate with you at all, muſt communicate with you, in your corruptions. But it is you that will not perceive the difference, between, being a part of the Church, and being in external Communion with all the other parts of it: taking for granted, that which is certainly falſe, that no two Men or Churches, divided in external communion, can be both true parts of the Catholique Church.

51. We are not *to learn the difference between Schiſm and Hereſie*, for Hereſie we conceive, An obſtinate defence of any error againſt any neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian faith: and Schiſm, A cauſleſs ſeparation of one part of the Church from another. But this we ſay, That if we convince you of errors, and corruptions, profeſſed and practiſed in your Communion, then

then we cannot be Schismaticks, for refusing to joyn with you in the profession of these Errors, and the practise of these corruptions. And therefore you must free either us from Schism, or your selves from error: at least from requiring the profession of it as a condition of your communion.

52. Lastly, whereas you say, *That you have demonstrated against us, that Protestants divided themselves from the external communion of the Visible Church*, add, *which external communion was corrupted*, and we shall confess the accusation, and glory in it. But this is not that *Quod erat demonstrandum*, but that we divided our selves from the Church, that is, made our selves out-lawes from it, and no members of it. And moreover, in the Reason of our separation from the external communion of your Church you are mistaken: for it was not so much because she, your Church, as because your Churches external communion, was corrupted, and needed Reformation.

53. *That a pretence of Reformation will acquit no man from Schism*, we grant very willingly, and therefore say, that it concernes every man who separates from any Churches communion, even as much as his Salvation is worth, to look most carefully to it, that the cause of his separation be just and necessary: For unless it be necessary, it can very hardly be sufficient. But whether a true Reformation of our selves from errors, superstition, and impieties, will not justifie our separation in these things; our separation, I say, from them who will not reform themselves, and, as much as in them lies, hinder others from doing so: This is the point you should have spoken to, but have not. As for the sentences of the Fathers to which you refer us, for the determination of this Question, I suppose by what I have said above, the Reader understands, by alleadging them you have gain'd little credit to your cause or person. And that, if they were competent Judges of this controversie, their sentence is against you much rather than for you.

54. Lastly, *whereas you desire D.* Potter *to remember his own words: There neither was nor can be any just cause to depart from the Church of Christ, no more than from Christ himself, and pretend that you have shewed that* Luther *did so*: The Doctor remembers his words very well, and hath no reason to be ashamed of them. Only he desires you to remember that hereafter you do not confound, as hitherto you have done Departing from the Church (*i. e.* ceasing to be a member of it,) with departing from the Churches external communion; and then he is perswaded it will appear to you, that against *Luther* and his followers you have said many things, but shewed nothing.

55. But *the Church Universal, remaining the Church Universal, according to D.* Potter *may fall into error: And from hence it cleerly followes, that it is impossible to leave the external communion of the Church so corrupted, and retain external communion with the Catholique Church.* Ans. The reason of this consequence which you say is so cleer, truly I cannot possibly discern; But the conclusion inferr'd, me-thinks, is evident of it self, and therefore without proof I grant it. I mean, that it is impossible to leave the external communion of the Catholique Church corrupted, and to retain external communion with the Catholique Church. But what use you can make of it, I do not understand: Unless you will pretend, that to say a man may forsake the Churches corruptions, and not the Church, is all one as to say, he may forsake the Churches external communion and not forsake it. If you mean so, sure you mistake the meaning of Protestants when they say, They forsook

not the Church but her corruptions. For in ſaying ſo, they neither affirm, nor deny that they forſook the external communion of the Church, nor ſpeak at all of it: But they mean only, that they ceaſed not to be ſtill members of the Church, though they ceaſed to believe and practiſe ſome things which the whole Church formerly did believe and practiſe. And as for the external Communion of the Viſible Church, we have without ſcruple formerly granted, that Proteſtants did forſake it, that is, renounce the practice of ſome obſervances, in which the whole Viſible Church before them did communicate. But this we ſay they did without Schiſm, becauſe they had cauſe to do ſo, and no man can have cauſe to be a Schiſmatique,

56. But your Argument you conceive, will be more convincing, *if we conſider that when* Luther *appeared, there were not two diſtinct Viſible true Churches, one Pure, the other Corrupted, but one Church only.* Anſ. The ground of this is no way certain, nor here ſufficiently proved. For, whereas you ſay, Hiſtories are ſilent of any ſuch matter; I anſwer, there is no neceſſity, that you or I ſhould have read all Hiſtories, that may be extant of this matters; nor that all ſhould be extant that were written, much leſs extant uncorrupted: eſpecially, conſidering your Church, which had lately all the power in her hands, hath been ſo pernitiouſly induſtrious, in corrupting the monuments of Antiquity that made againſt her; nor that all Records ſhould remain which were written; nor that all ſhould be recorded which was done. Neither ſecondly, to ſuppoſe a Viſible Church before *Luther*, which did not err, is it to contradict this ground of D. *Potters*, that the Church may err. Unleſs you will have us believe, that, *May be*, and *Muſt be* is all one, and that all which may be true, is true: which rule if it were true, then ſure all men would be honeſt, becauſe all men may be ſo; and you would not make ſo bad Arguments, unleſs you will pretend, you cannot make better. Nor thirdly, is it to contradict theſe words, *The Church may not hope to triumph over all error, till ſhe be in Heaven:* For to triumph over error is to be ſecure from it, to be out of danger of it, not to be obnoxious to it. Now a Church may be free from error, and yet not ſecure from it, and conſequently in this ſenſe, not triumph over it. Fourthly, whereas you ſay, *it evacuateth the brag of Proteſtants, that* Luther *reformed the whole Church*; perhaps (though I know not who they be that ſay ſo,) by a frequent Synecdoche, they may mean by the whole the greateſt, and moſt illuſtrious part of it, the luſtre whereof did much obſcure the other, though it were not wholly inviſible. Beſides, if their brag be evacuated, (as you call it) let it be ſo, I ſee no harm will come of it. Laſtly whereas you ſay, that ſuppoſing a viſible pure Church, *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatick who ſeparated from all viſible Churches: I tell you, if you will ſuppoſe a viſible Church extant before and when *Luther* aroſe, conformable to him in all points of doctrin, neceſſary and profitable, then *Luther* ſeparated not from this Church, but adjoyned himſelf to it: Not indeed in place, which was not neceſſary, not in external communion which was impoſſible, but by the Union of faith and charity. Upon theſe grounds, I ſay, that the ground of this Argument is no way made certain; yet becauſe it is not manifeſtly falſe, I am content to let it paſs. And, for ought I ſee, it is very ſafe for me to do ſo: for you build nothing upon it which I may not fairly grant. For what do you conclude from hence, but that, ſeeing there was no Viſible Church but corrupted, *Luther* forſaking the external communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forſake the external communion of the Catholique Church?

Well

Well, let this also be granted, what will come of it? What, that *Luther* must be a Schismatique? By no means: For not every separation, but only a causeless separation from the communion of the Church we maintain to be Schismatical. Hereunto may be added, that though the whole Church were corrupted, yet properly speaking, it is not true, that *Luther* and his Followers forsook the whole corrupted Church, or the external communion of it: But only that he forsook that Part of it which was corrupted, and still would be so, and forsook not, but only reformed another Part, which Part they themselves were, and I suppose you will not go about to persuade us, that they forsook themselves or their own communion. And if you urge, that they joyned themselves to no other part, therefore they separated from the whole: I say, it follows not, in as much as themselves were a part of it, and still continued so: and therefore could no more separate from the whole than from themselves. Thus though there were no part of the people of *Rome*, to whom the *Plebeians* joyned themselves, when they made their Secession into the Aventine Hill; yet they divided themselves from the *Patricians* only and not from the whole people, because themselves were a part of this people, and they divided not from themselves.

57. *Ad* ℣. 18. In the 18. ℣. you prove that which no man denies, that *Corruption in manners yeelds no sufficient cause to leave the Church*: yet sure, it yields sufficient cause to cast them out of the Church, that are, after the Churches publique admonition, obstinate in notorious impieties. Neither doth the cutting off such men from the Church, lay any necessity upon us, either to go out of the world, or out of the Church, but rather puts these men out of the Church into the world, where we may converse with them freely, without scandal to the Church. *Our blessed Saviour foretold*, you say, *that there should be in the Church tares with choise corn.* Look again, I pray, and you shall see, that the field he speaks of, is not the Church, but *the world*: and therefore neither do you obey our Saviour's command, *Let both grow up till the harvest*, who teach it to be lawfull to root these tares (such are Heretiques) out of the world: neither do Protestants disobey it, if they eject manifest Hreretiques and notorious sinners out of the Church.

58. *Ad* ℣. 19. In the 19. you are so curteous as to suppose *corruptions in your doctrin*: and yet undertake to prove that, *neither could they afford us any sufficient cause, or colourable necessity to depart from them.* Your reason is, *Because damnable errors there were none in your Church, by D.* Potters *confession, neither can it be damnable in respect of error, to remain in any Churches communion, whose errors are not damnable. For if the error be not damnable, the belief thereof cannot.* Ans. D. *Potter* confesseth no such matter: but only that *he hopes that your errors though in themselves sufficiently damnable, yet by accident did not damn all that held them*: such he means and saies, as were excusably ignorant of the Truth, and amongst the number of their unknown sins, repented daily of their unknown errors. The truth is, he thinks as ill of your errors and their desert, as you do of ours: only he is not so peremptory and presumptuous in judging your persons, as you are in judging ours, but leaves them to stand or fall to their own Master, who is infinitely merciful, and therefore will not damn them for meer errors, who desire to find the truth and cannot: and withal infinitely just, and therefore (it is to be feared) will not pardon them, who might easily have come to the know-

ledge of the truth, and either through Pride, or Obſtinacie, or Negligence would not.

59. To your minor alſo, I anſwer almoſt in your own words, §. 42. of this Chap. *I thank you for your courteous* Suppoſal, that your Church may erre, and *in recompence thereof, will do you a charity, by putting you in mind, into what Labyrinths you caſt your ſelf*, by ſuppoſing that the Church may erre in ſome of her Propoſals, and yet denying it lawful for any man though he know this, which you ſuppoſe, to oppoſe her judgement, or leave her communion. *Will you have ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his conſcience, or externally deny that which he knows true?* No, that you will not for them that doſo, you your ſelf have pronouced a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants. Or would you have him continue in your Communion, and yet profeſs your Church to erre? This you your ſelves have made to him impoſſible. Or would you have him believe thoſe things true, which together with him you have ſuppoſed to be Errors? This is ſuch a one, as is aſſur'd or perſwaded of that, which you here ſuppoſe, that your Church doth erre, (and ſuch only, we ſay, are obliged to forſake your communion,) is, *as Schoolmen ſpeak*, Implicatio in terminis, *a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroyeth another; as if one ſhould ſay, a living dead man.* For it is to require that they which believe ſome part of your Doctrin falſe, ſhould withall believe it all true. Seeing therefore, for any man to believe your Church in error, and profeſs the contrary, is damnable Hypocriſie; to believe it and not believe it, a manifeſt repugnancy; and thirdly, to profeſs it and to continue in your Communion (as matters now ſtand) a plain impoſſibility; what remians, but that whoſoever is ſuppoſed to have juſt reaſon to disbelieve any doctrin of your Church, muſt of neceſsity forſake her Communion? Unleſs you would remit ſo far from your preſent rigour, as to allow them your Churches communion, who publikely profeſs that they do not believe every article of her eſtabliſhed doctrin. Indeed, if you would do ſo, you might with ſome coherence ſuppoſe your Church in error, and yet find fault with men for abandoning her communion, becauſe they might continue in it, and ſuppoſe her in error. But to ſuppoſe your Church in error, and to excommunicate all thoſe that believe your own ſuppoſition, and then to complain that they continue not in your communion, is the moſt ridiculous incongruity that can be imagined. And therefore though your corruptions in doctrin, in themſelves (which yet is falſe) did not, yet your obliging us to profeſs your doctrin uncorrupted againſt knowledge and conſcience, may induce an obligation to depart from your communion. As, if there were any ſociety of Chriſtians, that held there were no Antipodes; notwithſtanding this error, I might communicate with them. But if I could not do ſo, without profeſsing my ſelf of their belief in this matter, then I ſuppoſe I ſhould be excus'd from Schiſm, if I ſhould forſake their communion, rather than profeſs my ſelf to believe that which I do not believe. Neither is there any contradiction or ſhadow of contradiction, that it may be neceſſary for my ſalvation to depart from this Churches communion: And that this Church (though erring in this matter) wants nothing neceſſary to Salvation. And yet this is that manifeſt contradiction, which D. *Potter* (you ſay) will never be able to ſalve; *viz. That there might be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of* Rome *in ſome Doctrins and Practiſes, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.*

60. And

60. And your Reason wherewith you prove, that there is in these words such a plain contradiction, is very notable. *For* (say you) *if she wanted nothing necessary to salvation, How could it be necessary to salvation to forsake her?* Truly Sir, if this be a good maner of proving, it is a very ready way to prove any thing; for what is there that may not be proved, if it be proof enough to ask, How it can be otherwise? Me thinks if you would convince D. *Potters* words of manifest contradiction, you should shew, that he affirms and denies the same of the same. From which fault me thinks he should be very innocent, who saies only, that that may be damnable to one, which is not so to another; and that may be necessary for one, which is not necessary for another. And this is all that D. *Potter* saies here: *viz.* That the profession of a falsehood to him that believes it, may be not damnable: and yet damnable to him that believes the contrary. Or that, not to profess a falsehood in him that knows it to be so, is necessary to salvation: and yet not so, in him that by error conceives it to be a truth. The words by you cited, and charged with unsalvable contradiction are in the 75. pag. But in the progress of the same particular discourse, in the next page but one he gives such evident reason of them, (which can hardly be done to prove implicancy true) that whereas you say, *he will never be able to salve them from contradiction*, I believe any indifferent reader, having considered the place, will be very apt to think, that you (whatsoever you pretend) were very able to have done this curtesie for him, if your will had been answerable to your ability. I will set down the words, and leave the Reader to condemn or absolve them. *To forsake the errors of that Church, and not to joyn with her in those practises which we account erroneous, we are inforced by necessity. For though in the issue they are not damnable to them which believe as they profess, yet for us to profess a vow by oath (as the Church of* Rome *enjoyns) what we believe not, were without question damnable. And they with their errors, by the grace of God might go to Heaven, when we for our hypocrisie and dissimulation* (he might have added, *and perjury*) *should certainly be condemned to Hell*

61. *Ad* § 20. *But a Church not erring in Fundamentals, though erring in other matters, doth what our Saviour exacts at her hands, doth as much as lies in her power to do: Therefore the communion of such a Church is not upon pretence of Error to be forsaken.* The consequence is manifest. The antecedent is proved, because *God, by D.* Potters *confession, hath promised his assistance no further, nor is it in her power to do more than God doth assist her to do.* Ans. The promise of Divine Assistance is two-fold: Absolute, or Conditional. That there shall be by Divine providence preserv'd in the world to the worlds end, such a Company of Christians, who hold all things precisely and indispensably necessary to salvation, and nothing inevitably destructive of it: This and no more the Doctor affirms that God hath promised absolutely. Yet he neither doubts nor denies, but that a farther assistance is conditionally promised us, even such an assistance as shall lead us, if we be not wanting to it and our selves, into all not only necessary, but very profitable truth, and guard us from all not only destructive, but also hurtful Errors. This, I say, he neither denies nor questions. And should he have done so, he might have been confuted by evident and expres Text of Scripture. When therefore you say, That *a Church not erring in Fundamentals, doth as much as by God's assistance lies in her power to do*, This is manifestly untrue.

For God's aſſiſtance is alwaies ready to promote her farther. It is ready, I ſay, but on condition the Church does implore it: on condition, that when it is offered in the divine directions of Scripture and Reaſon, the Church be not negligent to follow it. If therefore there be any Church, which, retaining the Foundation, builds *hay and ſtubble* upon it; which believing what is ſo preciſely neceſſary, errs ſhamefully and dangerouſly in other things very profitable: This by no means argues defect of divine aſſiſtance in God, but neglect of this aſſiſtance in the Church. Neither is there any reaſon, why ſuch a Church ſhould pleaſe her ſelf too much for retaining fundamental truths, while ſhe remains ſo regardleſs of others. For though the ſimple defect of ſome truths profitable only and not ſimply neceſſary, may conſiſt with ſalvation; yet, Who is there that can give her ſufficient aſſurance, that the neglect of ſuch truths is not damnable? Beſides, Who is there that can put her in ſufficient caution, that theſe Errors about profitable matters may not, according to the uſual fecundity of error, bring forth others of a higher quality, ſuch as are pernicious and peſtilent, and undermine by ſecret conſequences the very foundations of Religion and Piety? Laſtly, Who can ſay that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God & man by avoiding only Fundamental Hereſies, if in the mean time ſhe be negligent of others, which though they do not plainly deſtroy Salvation, yet obſcure and hinder, and only not block up the way to it? Which though of themſelves and immediatly they damn no man, yet are cauſes and occaſions that many men run the race of Chriſtian piety more remiſly than they ſhould, many deferr their repentance, many go on ſecurely in their ſins, and ſo at length are damn'd by means and occaſion of theſe Errors, though not for them. Such Errors as theſe, (though thoſe of the *Roman* Church be much worſe, even *in themſelves damnable, and by accident only pardonable*) yet, I ſay, ſuch Errors as theſe, if any Church ſhould tolerate, diſſemble, and ſuffer them to reign, and neglect to reform them, and not permit them to be freely, yet peaceably, oppoſed and impugned; Will any wiſe man ſay, that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man? that ſhe hath with due fidelity diſpenſed the Goſpel of Chriſt? that ſhe hath done what ſhe could, and what ſhe ought? What ſhall we ſay then, if theſe errors be taught by her, and commanded to be taught? What if ſhe thunder out her curſes againſt thoſe that will not believe them? What if ſhe rave and rage againſt them, and perſecute them with fire & ſword, & all kinds of moſt exquiſite torments? Truly I do much fear, that from ſuch a Church (though it hold no error abſolutely unconſiſtent with ſalvation,) the Candleſtick of God, either is already removed, or will be very ſhortly; and becauſe ſhe is negligent of profitable truths, that ſhe will loſe thoſe that are Neceſſary; and becauſe ſhe will not be led into all truths, that in ſhort time ſhe ſhall be led into none. And although this ſhould not happen, yet what mortal man can ſecure us, that not only a probable unaffected ignorance, not only a meer neglect of profitable truths, but alſo a retchleſs ſupine negligence, manifeſt contempt, Diſſimulation, Oppoſition, Oppreſſion of them may conſiſt with ſalvation? I truly for my part, though I hope very well of all ſuch, as, ſeeking all truth, find that which is neceſſary; who endeavouring to free themſelves from all Errors, any way contrary to the purity of Chriſtianity, yet fail of performance and remain in ſome: yet if I did not find in my ſelf a love and deſire of all profitable truth; If I did not put away idleneſs, and prejudice, and worldly

worldly affections, and so examin to the bottom all my opinions of divine matters, being prepar'd in mind to follow God, and God only, which way soever He shall lead me; If I did not hope, that I either do, or endeavour to do these things, certainly I should have little hope of obtaining salvation.

62. *But to oblige any man under pain of damnation to forsake a Church by reason of such errours, against which Christ thought it superfluous to promise his assistance, and for which he neither denies his grace here, nor his glory hereafter, what is it but to make the narrow way to heaven, narrower than Christ left it? Answ.* It is not: for Christ himself hath obliged us hereunto. He hath forbad us under pain of damnation to profess what we believe not, and consequently under the same penalty, to leave that Communion, in which we cannot remain without this hypocritical profession of those things, which we are convinc'd to be erroneous. But then besides, it is here falsely supposed, (as hath been shewed already) that Christ hath not promised assistance to those that seek it, but only in matters simply necessary. Neither is there any reason, why any Church, even in this world, should despair of victory over all errours pernitious or noxious; provided she humbly and earnestly implore divine assistance, depend wholly upon it, and be not wanting to it. Though a *Triumph over all sin and errour*, that is, security that she neither doth nor can err, be rather to be desired than hoped for on earth, being a felicity reserved for heaven.

63. *Ad Q. 21. But at least the Roman Church is as infallible as Protestants; and Protestants as fallible as the Roman Church: therefore to forsake the Roman Church for errours, what is it but to flit from one erring Society to another? Ans.* The inconsequence of this Argument is too apparent: Protestants may err as well as the Church of *Rome*, therefore they did so! Boys in the Schools know, that *à Posse ad Esse*, the Argument follows not. He is equally fallible who believes twice two to be four, as he that believes them to be twenty: yet in this, he is not equally deceived, and he may be certain that he is not so. One Architect is no more infallible than another, and yet he is more secure that his work is right and streight who hath made it by the level, than he which hath made it by guess and by chance. So he that forsakes the errours of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore renounceth her communion, that he may renounce the profession of her errours, though he knows himself fallible, as well as those whom he hath forsaken, yet he may be certain (as certain as the nature of the thing will bear) that he is not herein deceived: because he may see the doctrin forsaken by him repugnant to Scripture, and the doctrin embraced by him consonant to it. At least, this he may know, that the doctrin which he hath chosen to him seems true, and the contrary which he hath forsaken, seems false: And therefore without remorse of conscience, he may profess that, but this he cannot.

64. But *we are to remember, that, according to* D. Potter, *the visible Church hath a blessing not to err in Fundamentals, in which any private Reformer may fail, therefore there was no necessity of forsaking the Church, out of whose communion they were exposed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable errours. Answ.* The visible Church is free indeed from all errours absolutely destructive and unpardonable, but not from all errour which in it is self damnable: not from all which will actually bring damnation upon them, that keep themselves in them, by their own

voluntary

voluntary and avoidable fault. From ſuch errours which are thus damnable, D. *Potter* doth no where ſay, that the viſible Church hath any priviledge or exemption. Nay, you your ſelf teach, that he plainly teacheth the contrary, and thereupon will allow him to be no more charitable to Papiſts, than Papiſts are to Proteſtants: and yet upon this affected miſtake your Diſcourſe is founded in almoſt forty places of your Book. Beſides, any private man who truly believes the Scripture, and ſeriouſly endeavours to know the will of God, and to do it, is as ſecure as the viſible Church, more ſecure than your Church, from the danger of erring in fundamentals: for it is impoſſible, that any man ſo qualified ſhould fall into any errour which to him will prove damnable. For God requires no more of any man to his Salvation, but his true endeavour to be ſaved. Laſtly, abiding in your Churches Communion is ſo farr from ſecuring me or any man from damnable errour, that if I ſhould abide in it, I am certain I could not be ſaved. For abide in it I cannot, without profeſſing to believe your entire doctrin true: profeſs this I cannot, but I muſt lie perpetually, and exulcerate my conſcience. And though your errours were not in themſelves damnable, yet to reſiſt the known Truth, and to continue in the profeſſion of known errours and falſehood, is certainly a capital ſin, and of great affinity with the ſin which ſhall never be forgiven.

65. But *neither is the Church of Proteſtants perfectly free from errours and corruptions: ſo the Doctor confeſſes p. 69. which he can only excuſe, by ſaying, they are not fundamental, as likewiſe thoſe in the Roman Church, are confeſſed not to be fundamental. And what man of judgment will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupted one? Anſ.* And yet you your ſelf make large Diſcourſes in this very Chapter, to perſwade Proteſtants to continue in the Church of *Rome*, though ſuppoſed to have ſome corruptions. And why, I pray, may not a man of judgment continue in this Communion of a Church confeſſedly corrupted, as well as a Church ſuppoſed to be corrupted, requires the belief and profeſſion of her ſuppoſed corruptions, as the condition of her Communion: which this Church, confeſſedly corrupted, doth not. What man of judgment will think it any diſparagement to his judgment, to preferr the better, though not ſimply the beſt, before that which is ſtark naught? To preferr indifferent good health, before a diſeaſed and corrupted ſtate of Body? To preferr a field not perfectly weeded, before a field that is quite over-run with weeds and thorns? And therefore though Proteſtants have ſome Errours, yet ſeeing they are neither ſo great as yours, nor impos'd with ſuch tyranny, nor maintained with ſuch obſtinacy; he that conceives it any diſparagement to his judgment, to change your Communion for theirs, though confeſſed to have ſome corruptions, it may well be preſum'd that he hath but little judgment. For as for your pretence that yours are confeſſed not to be Fundamental, it is an affected miſtake as already I have often told you.

66. *Ad Q. 22. But D.* Potter *ſayes, It is comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all her capital dangers: but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſin and errour, till ſhe be in heaven. Now if it be comfort enough, to be ſecur'd from all capital dangers, which can ariſe only from errour in fundamental points, Why were not our firſt Reformers content with enough, but would needs diſmember the Church, out of a pernitious greedineſs of more than enough? Anſw.* I have already ſhewed ſufficiently, how

how capital danger may arise from errours, though not fundamental. I add now, that what may be enough for men in ignorance, may be to knowing men not enough: according to that of the Gospel, *to whom much is given, of him much shall be required:* That the same errour may be not capital to those who want means of finding the truth, and capital to others who have means, and neglect to use them: That to continue in the profession of errour discovered to be so, may be damnable, though the errour be not so. These I presume are reasons enough, and enough why the first Reformers might think, and justly, that not enough for themselves, which yet to some of their Predecessors they hope might be enough. This very Argument was objected to (a) S. *Cyprian* upon another occasion, and also by the (b) British *Quartodecimans*, to the maintainers of the Doctrin of your Church; and (c by both this very answer was returned; and therefore I cannot but hope that for their sakes you will approve it.

(a) S. *Cyprian*: *Ep.* 63. In these words. *Si quis de antecessoribus nostris, vel ignoranter vel simpliciter non hoc observavit, & tenuit quod nos Dominus facere Exemplo & Magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus, de indulgentia Domini, venia concedi: nobis verò non potest ignosci, qui nunc à Domino admoniti & instructi sumus.* (b) *Wilfridus*, to Abbot *Colman* alleadging that he followeth the example of his Predecessors famous for holiness, and famous for miracles, in these words, *De Patre vestro Columba & sequacibus ejus, quorum sanctitatem vos imitari & regu'am ac præcepta cœlestibus signis confirmata sequi perhibetis, possum respondere; Quia multis in judicio dicentibus Domino quòd in nomine ejus prophetaverint & dæmonia ejecerint, & virtutes multas fecerint, respondturus sit Dominus, quia nunquam eos noverit. Sed absit ut de patribus vestris hoc dicam, quia justius multo est de incognitis bonum credere quam malum. Unde & illos Dei famulos & Deo dilectos esse non nego, qui simplicitate rustica, sed intentione pia Deum dilexerunt: Neque illis multum obesse Paschæ talem reor observantiam, quam diu nullus advenerat qui eis instituti perfectioris decreta quæ sequerentur ostenderet. Quos utique credo, siquis tunc ad eos Catholicus circulator adveniret, sic ejus monita fuisse secuturos, quomodo ea quæ noverant ac didicerunt Dei mandata, probantur fuisse secuti. Tu autem & socii tui si audita decreta sedis Apostolicæ, imo universalis Ecclesiæ, & hæc literis sacris confirmata contemnitis, absque ulla dubietate peccatis.* (c) Beda: *lib* 3. *Eccl. Hist. c.* 25.

67. But *if (as the Doctor says) no Church may hope to triumph over all errour till she be in Heaven, then we must either grant, that errours not fundamental cannot yield sufficient cause to forsake the Church, or you must affirm, that all Communities may and ought to be forsaken. Answ.* The Doctor does not say, that no Church may hope to be free from all errour, either pernitious, or any way noxious: But that *no Church may hope to be secure from all errour simply*, for this were indeed truly to triumph over all. But then we say not, that the Communion of any Church is to be forsaken for errors unfundamental, unless it exact withall either a dissimulation of them being noxious; or a Profession of them against the dictate of Conscience, if they be meer errours. This, if the Church does (as certainly yours doth,) then her Communion is to be forsaken, rather than the sin of Hypocrisie to be committed. Whereas to forsake the Churches of Protestants for such errours, there is no necessity, because they err to themselves, and do not under pain of Excommunication exact the profession of their errours.

68. But *the Church may not be left by reason of sin, therefore neither by reason of errours not fundamental: in as much as both sin and errour are impossible to be avoided till she be in heaven. Ans.* The reason of the consequence does not appear to me: But I answer to the Antecedent: Neither for sin nor errours, ought a Church to be forsaken, if she does not impose and injoyn them: but if she do, (as the *Roman* does) then we must forsake men rather than God; leave the Churches communion rather than commit sin, or profess known errours to be divine truths. For the Prophet *Ezekiel* hath assured us, that to say, *The Lord hath said so, when the Lord hath not said so*, is a great sin, and a high presumption, be the matter never so small.

69. *Ad*

69. *Ad §.23.* But *neither the quality nor the number of your Churches errours, could warrant our forſaking of it. Not the quality, becauſe we ſuppoſe them not fundamental. Not the number, becauſe the foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport them. Anſw.* Here again you vainly ſuppoſe, that we conceive your errours in themſelves not damnable: Though, we hope, they are not abſolutely unpardonable: but to ſay they are pardonable, is indeed to ſuppoſe them damnable. Secondly, though the errours of your Church did not warrant our departure, yet your Tyrannous Impoſition of them, would be our ſufficient juſtification. For this layes neceſſity on us, either to forſake your company, or to profeſs what we know to be falſe.

70. Our *Bleſſed Saviour hath declared his will, that we forgive a private offender ſeventy ſeven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of treſpaſſes; and then, how dare we alleage his command, that we muſt not pardon his Church for errours acknowledged to be not fundamental? Anſ.* He that commands us to pardon our brother ſinning againſt us ſo often, will not allow us for his ſake to ſin with him, ſo much as once. He will have us do any thing but ſin, rather than offend any man. But his will is alſo, that we offend all the World, rather than ſin in the leaſt matter. And therefore though his will were, and it were in our power (which yet is falſe) to pardon the errours of an erring Church; yet certainly it is not his will, that we ſhould err with the Church, or if we do not, that we ſhould againſt conſcience profeſs the errours of it.

71. *Ad §.24.* But *Schiſmatiques from the Church of* England, *or any other Church, with this very Anſwer, that they forſake not the Church, but the errours of it, may caſt off from themſelves the imputation of Schiſm. Anſ.* True, they may make the ſame Anſwer, and the ſame defence as we do, as a murtherer can cry Not guilty, as well as an innocent perſon, but not ſo truly, nor ſo juſtly. The queſtion is, not what may be pretended, but what can be proved by Schiſmatiques. They may object errours to other Churches, as well as we do to yours; but that they prove their accuſation ſo ſtrongly as we can, that appears not. To the Prieſts and Elders of the Jews, impoſing that ſacred ſilence mentioned in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, Saint *Peter*, and St. *John* anſwered, *They muſt obey God rather than men.* The three Children to the King of *Babylon*, gave in effect the ſame anſwer. Give me now any factious Hypocrite, who makes Religion the pretence and cloak of his Rebellion, and, Who ſees not that ſuch a one may anſwer for himſelf, in thoſe very formal words, which the holy Apoſtles and Martyrs made uſe of? And yet, I preſume, no Chriſtian will deny, but this Anſwer was good, in the mouth of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, though it were obnoxious to be abuſed, by Traytors, and Rebels. Certainly therefore it is no good conſequence to ſay, Schiſmatiques may make uſe of thi Anſwer, therefore all that do make uſe of it are Schiſmatiques. But moreover, it is to be obſerved, that the chief part of our defence, that you deny your communion to all that deny or doubt of any part of your doctrin, cannot with any colour be imployed againſt Proteſtants: who grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things neceſſary, that is, ſuch as are in Scripture plainly delivered.

72. *But the forſaking the Roman Church opens a way to innumerable Sects and Schiſms, and therefore it muſt not be forſaken. Anſ.* We muſt not do evil to avoid evil: neither are all courſes preſently lawful, by which inconveniences

conveniences may be avoided. If all men would submit themselves to the chief Mufty of the Turks, it is apparent there would be no divisions; yet unity is not to be purchased at so dear a rate. It were a thing much to be desired, that there were no divisions: yet difference of opinions touching points controverted, is rather to be chosen, than unanimous concord in damned errours: As it is better for men to go to heaven by divers ways, or rather by divers paths of the same way, than in the same path to go on peaceably to hell. *Amica Pax, magis amica Veritas!*

73. But there *can be no just cause to forsake the Church, so the Doctor grants: who notwithstanding teacheth that the Church may err in points not fundamental; therefore neither is the Roman Church to be forsaken for such errours. Ans.* There can be no just cause to forsake the Church absolutely and simply in all things, that is, to cease being a member of the Church: This I grant, if it will do you any service. But that there can be no just cause to forsake the Church in some things, or (to speak more properly) to forsake some opinions and practices, which some true Church retains and defends; this I deny, and you mistake the Doctor, if you think he affirms it.

74. *Ad §. 26, 27.* What *prodigious doctrins* (say you) *are these? Those Protestants who believe that your Church erred in points necessary to salvation, and for that cause left her, cannot be excused from damnable Schism: But others, &c.* Prodigious doctrins indeed! But who, I pray, are they that teach them? Where does D. *Potter* accuse those Protestants of *damnable Schism*, who left your Church because they hold it erroneous in necessary points? What Protestant is there that holds not that you taught things contrary to the plain precepts of Christ; both Ceremonial, in mutilating the Communion; and Moral, in points of Superstition and Idolatry, and most bloody tyranny? which is without question to err in necessary matters. Neither does D. *Potter* accuse any man of Schism for holding so: if he should, he should call himself a Schismatique. Only he says, such (if there be any such) as affirm, that ignorant souls among you, who had no means to know the truth, cannot possibly be saved, that their wisdom and charity cannot be justified. Now you your self have plainly affirmed, That *ignorant Protestants dying with contrition may be saved*; and yet would be unwilling to be thought to say, that Protestants err in no points necessary to salvation. For that may be in it self, and in ordinary course, where there are means of knowledge, necessary, which to a man invincibly ignorant, will prove not necessary. Again, where doth D. *Potter* suppose (as you make him) that there were other Protestants, who believed that your Church had no errours? Or, where does he say, they did well to forsake her, upon this ridiculous reason, because they judged that she retained all means necessary to salvation? Do you think us so stupid, as that we cannot distinguish between that which D. *Potter* says, and that which you make him say? He vindicates Protestants from Schism two ways: The one is, because they had just and great and necessary cause to separate, which Schismatiques never have; because they that have it, are no Schismatiques: For schism is always a causeless separation. The other is, because they did not joyn with their separation, an uncharitable damning of all those from whom they did divide themselves, as the manner of Schismatiques is. Now that

which

which he intends for a circumſtance of our ſeparation, you make him, make the cauſe of it, and the motive to it. And whereas he ſays, *Though we ſeparate from you in ſome things, yet we acknowledge your Church a member of the body of Chriſt, and therefore are not Schiſmatiques:* You make him ſay moſt abſurdly, *We did well to forſake you, becauſe we judged you a member of the body of Chriſt.* Juſt as if a brother ſhould leave his brothers company in ſome ill courſes, and ſhould ſay to him, Herein I forſake you, yet I leave you not abſolutely, for I acknowledge you ſtill to be my brother, and ſhall uſe you as a brother: And you perverting his ſpeech ſhould pretend that he had ſaid, I leave your company in theſe il courſes, and I do well to do ſo, becauſe you are my brother: ſo making that the cauſe of leaving him, which indeed is the cauſe that he left him no farther.

75. But you ſay, *The very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelf from Schiſm, is, becauſe he holds that the Church which they forſook, is not cut off from the Body of Chriſt. Anſ.* This is true: But can you not perceive a difference between juſtifying his ſeparation from Schiſm by this reaſon, and making this the reaſon of his ſeparation? If a man denying obedience in ſome unlawful matter to his lawful Soveraign, ſhould ſay to him, Herein I diſobey you, but yet I am no Rebel, becauſe I acknowledg you my Soveraign Lord, and am ready to obey you in all things lawful; ſhould not he be an egregious Sycophant, that ſhould accuſe him, as if he had ſaid, I do well to diſobey you, becauſe I acknowledge you my lawful Soveraign? Certainly, he that joyns this acknowledgment with his neceſſitated obedience, does well; but he that makes this conſideration the reaſon of diſobedience doth ill. Urge therefore this (as you call it) moſt ſolemn foppery as far as you pleaſe: For every underſtanding Reader will eaſily perceive that this is no foppery of D. *Potters*, but a calumny of yours; from which he is as far, as he is from holding yours to be the true Church: whereas it is a ſign of a great deal of Charity in him, that he allows you to be a Part of it.

76. And *whereas you pretend to find ſuch unſpeakable comfort herein, that we cannot clear our ſelves from Schiſm, otherwiſe than by acknowledging that they do not, nor cannot, cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation:* I beſeech you to take care that this falſe comfort coſt you not too dear. For why this good opinion of God Almighty, that he will not damn men for errour, who were without their own fault ignorant of the truth, ſhould be any conſolation to them, who, having the key of knowledge, will neither uſe it themſelves, nor permit others to uſe it; who have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, who have ears to hear and will not hear! this, I aſſure you, paſſeth my capacity to apprehend. Neither *is this to make our ſalvation depend on yours*, but only ours and yours not deſperately inconſiſtent, nor to ſay, we *muſt be damn'd, unleſs you may be ſaved*; but that we aſſure our ſelves, if our lives be anſwerable, we ſhall be ſaved by our knowledge. And that we hope, (and I tell you again, *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen*) that ſome of you may poſſibly be ſaved by occaſion of their unaffected ignorance.

77. For our brethren, whom you ſay, *we condemn of hereſie for denying the Churches perpetuity*, we know none that do ſo: unleſs you conceive a corrupted Church to be none at all; and, if you do, then for ought I know, in your account we muſt be all Heretiques; for all of us acknowledge that the Church might be corrupted even with errours in themſelves damnable, and not only might, but hath been.

78. *But*

78. *But Schism consists in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of faith: Now we must profess, you say, that we agree with the Church of* Rome *in all Fundamental Articles; Therefore we are Schismatiques. Ans.* Either in your Major, *by all points of faith*, you mean *all fundamental points only*, or *all simply and absolutely*. If the former, I deny your Major: for I may without all schism divide from that Church which errs in any point of faith Fundamental, or otherwise, if she require the profession of this Error among the conditions of her Communion. Now this is our case. If the later, I deny the syllogism, as having manifestly four tearms, and being cosen-german to this,

He that obeys God in all things is innocent;
Titius obeys God in some things;
Therefore he is innocent.

79. *But they who judge a reconciliation with the Church of* Rome *to be damnable, they that say, there might be just and necessary cause to depart from it, and that they of that Church which have understanding and means to discover their Errour, and neglect to use them, are not to be flattered with hope of salvation; they do cut off that Church from the body of Christ, and the hope of salvation, and so are Schismatiques: but D.* Potter *doth the former; therefore he is a schismatique. Ans.* No, he doth not: not cut off that whole Church from the hope of salvation, not those members of it who were invincibly, or excusably ignorant of the truth; but those only who having understanding and means to discover their errour, neglect to use them. Now these are not the whole Church; and therefore he that, supposing their impenitence, cuts these off from hope of salvation, cannot be justly said to cut off that whole Church from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation.

80. *Ad §.* 28, 29. Whereas D. *Potter says, There is a great difference between a Schism from them, and a Reformation of our selves: this,* you say, *is a quaint subtility, by which all Schism and Sin may be as well excused.* It seems then in your judgment, that theeves and adulterers, and murtherers, and traytors may say with as much probability as Protestants, that they did no hurt to others, but only reform themselves. But then methinks it is very strange, that all Protestants should agree with one consent in this defence of themselves from the imputation of Schism: & that to this day, never any Theef or Murtherer should have been heard of, to make use of this Apologie! And then for Schismatiques I would know, Whether *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, who excommunicated the Churches of *Asia*, for not conforming to his Church in keeping *Easter*; whether *Novatian* that divided from *Cornelius*, upon pretence that himself was elected Bishop of *Rome*, when indeed he was not; whether *Felicissimus* and his Crew, that went out of the Church of *Carthage*, and set up Altar against Altar, because having fallen in persecution, they might not be restored to the peace of the Church presently, upon the intercession of the Confessours; whether the *Donatists*, who divided from, and damned all the World, because all the World would not excommunicate them who were accused only, and not convicted, to have been Traditors of the sacred Books; whether they which for the slips and infirmities of others, which they might and ought to tolerate, or upon some difference in matters of Order and Ceremony, or for some Errour in Doctrin, neither pernitious nor hurtful to Faith or Piety, separate themselves from others, or others from themselves; or lastly, whether they

that put themſelves out of the Churches unity and obedience, becauſe their opinions are not approved there, but reprehended and confuted, or becauſe being of impious converſation, they are impatient of their Churches cenſure: I would know, I ſay, whether all, or any of theſe, may with any face, or without extream impudency, put in this plea of Proteſtants, and pretend with as much likelyhood as they, that they did not ſeparate from others, but only reform themſelves? But ſuppoſe they were ſo impudent as to ſay ſo in their own defence falſely, doth it follow by any good Logick, that therefore this Apology is not to be imployed by Proteſtants, who may ſay ſo truly? *We make* (ſay they) *no Schiſm from you, but only a reformation of our ſelves: This*, you reply, *is no good juſtification, becauſe it may be pretended by any Schiſmatique.* Very true, any Schiſmatique that can ſpeak may ſay the ſame words, (as any Rebel that makes Conſcience the cloak of his impious diſobedience, may ſay with Saint *Peter*, and Saint *John*, *We muſt obey God rather than men:*) But then the queſtion is, whether any Schiſmatique may ſay ſo truly? And to this queſtion you ſay juſt nothing: but conclude, becauſe this defence may be abuſed by ſome, it muſt be uſed by none. As if you ſhould have ſaid, S. *Peter*, and S. *John* did ill to make ſuch an anſwer as they made, becauſe impious Hypocrites might make uſe of the ſame to palliate their Diſobedience and Rebellion againſt the lawful commands of lawful Authority.

81. *But ſeeing their pretended Reformation conſiſted in forſaking the Churches corruptions, their Reformation of themſelves, and their diviſion from you, falls out to be one and the ſame thing.* Juſt as if two men having been a long while companions in drunkenneſs, one of them ſhould turn ſober; this Reformation of himſelf, and deſertion of his companion, in this ill cuſtom, would be one and the ſame thing, and yet there is no neceſſity that he ſhould leave his love to him at all, or his ſociety in other things. So Proteſtants forſaking their own former corruptions, which were common to them with you, could not chooſe but withal forſake you in the practice of theſe corruptions: yet this they might, and would have done without breach of Charity towards you; and without a renunciation of your company in any act of piety and devotion, confeſſedly lawful. And therefore though both theſe were by accident joyned together, yet this hinders not but that the end they aimed at, was not a ſeparation from you, but a reformation of themſelves.

82. Neither *doth their diſagreement in the particulars of the Reformation*, (which yet when you meaſure it without partiality, you will find to be farr ſhort of infinite) nor *their ſymbolizing in the general of forſaking your corruptions*, prove any thing to the contrary, or any way advantage your deſign or make for your purpoſe. For it is not any ſign at all, much leſs an evident ſign, that they had no ſetled deſign, but only to forſake the Church of *Rome*: for nothing but malice can deny, that their intent at leaſt was, to reduce Religion to that original purity from which it was fallen. The declination from which, ſome conceiving to have begun (though ſecretly) in the Apoſtles times, (*the myſtery of iniquity being then in work*;) and after their departure to have ſhewed it ſelf more openly: Others again believing, that the Church continued pure for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, and then declined: And conſequently ſome aiming at an exact conformity with the Apoſtolique times: Others thinking they ſhould do God

God and Men good ſervice, could they reduce the Church to the condition of the fourth and fifth Ages: Some taking their direction in this work of Reformation, only from Scripture; others, from the writings of Fathers, and the Decrees of Councels of the firſt five Ages: certainly, it is no great marvail, that there was, as you ſay, diſagreement between them, in the particulars of their Reformation; nay morally ſpeaking, it was impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe. Yet let me tell you, the difference between them (eſpecially in compariſon of your Church and Religion,) is not the difference between good and bad, but between good and better: And they did beſt that followed Scripture interpreted by Catholique written-Tradition: which Rule the reformers of the Church of *England*, propoſed to themſelves to follow.

83. *Ad §.* 30, 31, 32. To this effect D. *Potter*, p. 81, 82. of his Book, ſpeaks thus. *If a Monaſtery ſhould reform it ſelf, and ſhould reduce into practice ancient good diſcipline, when others would not: In this caſe could it be charged with Schiſm from others, or with Apoſtacy from its rule and order? So in a Society of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from it, could they be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the Society?* He preſumes they could not, and from hence concludes, *that neither can the Reformed Churches be truly accuſed for making a Schiſm, (that is, ſeparating from the Church, and making themſelves no members of it) if all they did was (as indeed it was) to reform themſelves.* Which Caſes, I believe, any underſtanding man will plainly ſee to have in them an exact parity of Reaſon, and that therefore the Argument drawn from them is preſsing and unanſwerable. And it may well be ſuſpected, that you were partly of this mind, otherwiſe you would not have ſo preſum'd upon the ſimplicity of your Reader, as pretending to anſwer it, to put another of your own making in place of it, and then to anſwer that.

84. This you do §. 31, 32. of this Chapter, in theſe words, *I was very glad to find you in a Monaſtery, &c.* Where I beſeech the Reader to obſerve theſe things to detect the cunning of your tergiverſation: Firſt, That you have no reaſon to ſay, *That you found D.* Potter *in a Monaſtery:* and as little, *That you find him inventing wayes how to forſake his vocation, and to maintain the lawfulneſs of Schiſm from the Church, and Apoſtacy from a Religious Order.* Certainly the innocent caſe put by the Doctor, of a Monaſtery reforming it ſelf, hath not deſerved ſuch grievous accuſations. Unleſs Reformation with you be all one with Apoſtacy: and to forſake ſin and diſorder, be to forſake ones Vocation. And ſurely, if it be ſo, your vocations are not very lawful, & your Religious Orders not very religious. Secondly, that you quite pervert and change D. *Potters* caſes, and inſtead of the caſe, of a *whole Monaſtery reforming it ſelf, when other Monaſteries of their Order would not*; and of *ſome men freeing themſelves from the common diſeaſe of their Society, when others would not*: you ſubſtitute two others, which you think you can better deal with; of *ſome particular Monks, upon pretence of the neglect of leſſer monaſtical obſervances going out of their Monaſtery, which Monaſtery yet did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantial Vows, and all Principal Statutes: And of a diſeaſed Perſon, quitting the company of thoſe that were infected with the ſame diſeaſe: though in their company, there was no danger from his diſeaſe, it being impoſsible that ſhould be mortal: and out of it, no hope of eſcaping others like that for which he forſook the firſt infected Company.* I appeal now to

any indifferent judge, whether theſe caſes be the ſame or neer the ſame with D. *Potters?* Whether this be fair and ingenuous dealing, in ſtead of his two Inſtances, which plainly ſhewed it poſſible in other Societies, and conſequently in that of the Church, to leave the faults of a Society, and not leave being of it, to foiſt in two others clean croſs to the Doctors purpoſe, of men under colour of faults, abandoning the Society wherein they lived? I know not what others may think of this dealing, but, to me, this declining D. *Potter's* caſes and conveying others into their place, is a great aſſurance, that as they were put by him, you could ſay nothing to them,

85. But that no ſuſpicion of tergiverſation may be faſtened upon me, I am content to deal with you a little, at your own weapons. Put the caſe then, though not juſt as you would have it, yet with as much favour to you, as in reaſon you can expect, That a Monaſtery did obſerve her ſubſtantial vows, and all Principal Statutes; but yet did generally practiſe, and alſo enjoyn the violation of ſome leſſer, yet obliging obſervances, and had done ſo time out of mind: And that ſome inferiour Monks more conſcientious than the reſt, diſcovering this abuſe, ſhould firſt with all earneſtneſs ſollicite their Superiours for a general and orderly reformation of theſe, though ſmall and venial corruptions, yet corruptions: But finding they hop'd and labour'd in vain to effect this, ſhould reform theſe faults in themſelves, and refuſe to joyn in the practiſe of them, with the reſt of their Confraternity, and perſiſting reſolutely in ſuch a refuſal, ſhould by their Superiours be caſt out of their Monaſtery, and being not to be re-admitted without a promiſe of remitting from their ſtiffeneſs in theſe things, and of condeſcending to others in the practiſe of theſe ſmall faults, ſhould chooſe rather to continue exiles, than to re-enter upon ſuch conditions: I would know whether you would condemn ſuch men of Apoſtacy from the Order? Without doubt, if you ſhould, you would find the ſtream of your Caſuiſts againſt you; and, beſides, involve S. *Paul* in the ſame condemnation, who plainly tells us, that *we may not do the leaſt evil, that we may do the greateſt good.* Put caſe again, you ſhould be part of a Society univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, and diſcovering a certain remedy for this diſeaſe, ſhould perſwade the whole company to make uſe of it, but find the greateſt part of them ſo farr in love with their diſeaſe, that they were reſolved to keep it; nay ſo fond of it, that they ſhould make a decree, that whoſoever would leave it, ſhould leave their company. Suppoſe now, that your ſelf and ſome few others, ſhould notwithſtanding their injunction to the contrary, free your ſelves from this diſeaſe, and thereupon they ſhould abſolutely forſake and reject you: I would know in this caſe who deſerves to be condemned, whether you of uncharitable deſertion of your company, or they of a tyrannical peeviſhneſs? And if in theſe caſes you will (as I verily believe you will,) acquit the inferiors and condemn the ſuperiors, abſolve the minor part and condemn the major, then can you with no reaſon condemn Proteſtants, for chooſing rather to be ejected from the communion of the *Roman* Church, than with her to perſiſt (as of neceſſity they were to do, if they would continue in her communion) in the profeſsion of errors, though not deſtructive of ſalvation, yet hindring edification; and in the Practiſe, or at leaſt approbation of many (ſuppoſe not mortal but venial) corruptions.

86. Thirdly, the Reader may be pleas'd to be advertis'd that you cenſure too partially the corrupt eſtate of your *Church in comparing it to a Mona-*

Monastery, which did confessedly observe their substantial vows, and all principal Statutes of their Order, and moreover was secured by an infallible assistance, for the avoiding of all substantial corruptions: for of your Church we confess no such matter, but say plainly, That she not only might fall into substantial corruptions, but did so; that she did not only generally violate, but of all the members of her communion, either in act or approbation, require and exact the violation of many substantial laws of Christ, both Ceremonial and Moral, which though we hope it was pardonable in them, who had not means to know their error, yet, of its own nature, and to them who did or might have known their error, was certainly damnable. And that it was not the *tything of Mint, and Annise, and Cummin*, the neglect whereof we impute unto you, but *the neglect of judgment, justice, and the weightier matters of the Law.*

87. Fourthly, I am to represent unto you, that you use Protestants very strangely, in comparing them to a company, who all were *known to be led to their pretended Reformation, not with an intent of Reformation, but with some other sinister Intention*; which is impossible to be known of you, and therefore to judge so, is against Christian charity, and common equity: and to such a *Company as acknowledge that themselves, as soon as they were gone out from the Monastery that refused to reform, must not hope to be free from those or the like Errors, and Corruptions, for which they left their Brethren:* seeing this very hope and nothing else, moved them to leave your Communion: and this speech of yours, so farr as it concerns the same errors, plainly destroyes it self. For how can they possibly fall into the same errors by forsaking your Communion, which that they may forsake they do forsake your Communion? And then for other errors of the like nature and quality, or more enormious than yours, though they deny it not possible, but by their negligence and wickedness they may fall into them, yet they are so far from acknowledging that they have no hope to avoid this mischief, that they proclaim to all the world, that it is most prone and easie to do so, to all those that fear God and love the Truth; and hardly possible for them to do otherwise, without supine negligence and extream impiety.

88. To fit the Reddition of your perverted Simile, to the Proposition of it, you tell *us that we teach, that for all fundamental points, the Church is secured from error.* I answer, Fundamental errors may signifie, either such as are repugnant to Gods command, and so in their own nature damnable, though to those which out of invincible ignorance practise them, not unpardonable: or such as are not only meritoriously, but remedilesly pernitious and destructive of Salvation. We hope that yours, and the *Greek*, and other Churches before the Reformation, had not so far apostated from Christ, as to be guilty of errors of the later sort. We say, that not only the Catholique Church, but every particular true Church, so long as it continues a Church, is secur'd from Fundamental errors of this kind, but secur'd not absolutely by any promise of divine assistance, which being not ordinarily irresistible, but temper'd to the nature of the Receivers, may be neglected, and therefore withdrawn; but by the Repugnance of any error in this sense fundamental to the essence and nature of a Church. So that, to speak properly, not any set known company of men is secur'd, that, though they neglect the means of avoiding error, yet certainly, they shall not err in fundamentals, which were necessary for the constitution of an infallible guide of

faith: But rather they which know what is meant by a Church, are ſecur'd or rather certain that a Church remaining a Church cannot fall into fundamental errors; becauſe, when it does ſo, it is no longer a Church. As they are certain, that men cannot become unreaſonable creatures, becauſe when they do ſo, they are no longer men. But for fundamental errors of the former ſort, which yet, I hope, will warrant our departure from any Communion infected with them and requiring the profeſſion of them; from ſuch fundamental errors, we do not teach ſo much as that the Church Catholique, much leſs, (which only were for your purpoſe,) that your Church hath any protection or ſecurity, but know for a certain, that many errors of this nature, had prevailed againſt you; and that a vain preſumption of an abſolute divine aſſiſtance (which yet is promiſed but upon conditions,) made both your preſent errors incurable and expoſed you to the imminent danger of more and greater. This therefore is either to abuſe what we ſay, or to impoſe falſely upon us what we ſay not. And to this you preſently add another manifeſt falſehood, *viz.* that we ſay, *That no particular perſon, or Church, hath any promiſe of aſſiſtance in points fundamental.* Whereas, croſs to this in diameter, there is no Proteſtant but holds, and muſt hold; that there is no particular Church; no, nor perſon; but hath promiſe of divine aſſiſtance to lead them into all neceſſary truth, if they ſeek it as they ſhould, by the means which God hath appointed. And ſhould we ſay otherwiſe, we ſhould contrary plain Scripture, which aſſures us plainly, That *every one that ſeeketh findeth, and every one that asketh receiveth:* and that *if we being evil, can give good gifts to our children, much more ſhall our heavenly Father, give his Spirit to them that ask it:* and that, *if any man want wiſdom* (eſpecially ſpiritual wiſdom) *he is to ask of God, who giveth to all men, and upbraideth not.*

89. You obtrude upon us thirdly, *That when* Luther *began, he being but one, oppoſed himſelf to all, as well Subjects as Superiors. Anſ.* If he did ſo in the cauſe of God, it was heroically done of him. This had been without hyperbolizing, *Mundus contra Athanaſium*, and *Athanaſius contra Mundum:* neither is it impoſſible, that *the whole world ſhould ſo far lie in wickedneſs,* (as S. *John* ſpeaks) that it may be lawful and noble for one man to oppoſe the world. But yet were we put to our oaths, we ſhould ſurely not teſtifie any ſuch thing for you; for how can we ſay properly & without ſtreining, that *he oppoſed himſelf to All*, unleſs we could ſay alſo, that All oppoſed themſelves to him? And how can we ſay ſo, ſeeing the world can witneſs, that ſo many thouſands, nay millions, followed his ſtandard aſſoon as it was advanced?

90. But, *none that lived immediately before him thought or ſpake as he did.* This is firſt nothing to the purpoſe. The Church was then corrupted, and ſure it was no diſhonour to him to begin the Reformation. In the Chriſtian warfare, every man ought to ſtrive to be foremoſt. Secondly, it is more than you can juſtifie. For though no man before him lifted up his voyce like a trumpet, as *Luther* did; yet who can aſſure us, but that many before him, both thought, and ſpake in the lower voyce of petitions and remonſtrances, in many points, as he did.

91. Fourthly and laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *many chief learned Proteſtants, are forced to confeſs the Antiquity of your Doctrin and Practiſe*: I anſwer: Of many Doctrins and Practiſes of yours, this is not true, nor pretended to be true by thoſe that have dealt in this Argument. Search your

Store-

Store-house, M. *Brerely*, who hath travailed as far in this Northwest discovery, as it was possible for humane industry, and when you have done so, I pray inform me, what confessions of Protestants have you, for the Antiquity of the Doctrin of the Communion in one kind: the lawfulness and expedience of the *Latin*-Service: For the present use of Indulgences: For the Popes power in Temporalities over Princes: For the picturing of the Trinity: For the lawfulness of the worship of Pictures: For your Beads and Rosary, and Ladies Psalter; and in a word, for your whole worship of the Blessed Virgin: For your Oblations by way of Consumption, and therefore in the quality of Sacrifices to the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints: For your saying of *Pater-nosters*, and Creeds to the honour of Saints, and of *Ave-Maries* to the hono[ur] of other Saints besides the Blessed Virgin: For the infallibility of the Bishop or Church of *Rome*: For your prohibiting the Scripture to be read publikely in the Church, in such languages as all may understand: For your Doctrin of the blessed Virgin's immunity from actual sin; and for your doctrin and worship of her immaculate Conception: For the necessity of Auricular Confession: For the necessity of the Priests Intention to obtain benefit by any of your Sacraments: And lastly, (not to trouble my self with finding out more) for this very Doctrin of Licentiousness, That though a man live and die without the Practise of Christian vertues, and with the habits of many damnable sins unmortified; yet if in the last moment of life, he have any sorrow for his sins, and joyn confession with it, certainly he shall be saved? Secondly, they that confess some of your doctrins to have been the Doctrin of the Fathers, may be mistaken, being abused by many words and phrases of the Fathers, which have the *Roman* sound, when they are farr from the sense. Some of them I am sure are so, I will name *Goulartius*, who in his Commentaries on S. *Cyprian*'s 35. *Ep.* grants that the sentence [*Hereſies have ſprung*, &c.] quoted by you §.36. of this Chapter, was meant of *Cornelius*: whereas it will be very plain to any attentive Reader, that S. *Cyprian* speaks there of himself. Thirdly, though some Protestants confess some of your Doctrin to be Ancient, yet this is nothing, so long as it is evident, even by the confession of all sides, that many errors, I instance in that of the *Millenaries*, and the communicating of Infants, were more ancient. Not any Antiquity therefore, unless it be absolute and primitive, is a certain sign of true Doctrin. For if the Church were obnoxious to corruption (as we pretend it was), who can possibly warrant us, that, part of this corruption might not get in and prevail in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. age? Especially seeing the Apostles assure us, that the *mystery of iniquity was working*, though more secretly even in their times. If any man ask, How could it become universal in so short a time? Let him tell me how the Errour of the Millenaries, and the communicating of Infants, became so soon universal; and then he shall acknowledge, what was done in some, was possible in others. Lastly, to cry quittance with you: as there are Protestants who confess the antiquity, but always post-nate to Apostolique, of some poynts of your Doctrin: so there want not Papists who acknowledge as freely, the Novelty of many of them, and the Antiquity of ours. A collection of whose testimony, we have (without thanks to you) in your *Indices expurgatorii*: The divine Providence, blessedly abusing for the readier manifestation of the Truth this engine intended by you for the subversion and suppression of it. Here is no place to stand upon parti-

particulars: only one general ingenuous confeſſion of that great *Eraſmus*, may not be paſs'd over in ſilence. *Non deſunt magni Theologi, qui nonverentur affirmare, Nihil eſſe in* Luthero, *quin per probatos authores defendi poßit*: There want not great Divines, which ſtick not to affirm, that there is nothing in *Luther*, which may not be defended by good and allowed authors. Whereas therefore you cloſe up this Simile with *conſider theſe points, and ſee whether your Similitude do not condemn your Progenitors of Schiſm from God's viſible Church*: I aſſure you, I have well conſidered them, and do plainly ſee that this is not D. *Potter*'s ſimilitude, but your own; and beſides, that it is wholly made up of miſtakes and falſhoods, and is at no hand, a ſufficient proof of this great Accuſation.

Eraſm. Ep. lib. 15. Ep ad Godeſchalcum Roſ.

92. Let us come now to the ſecond ſimilitude of your making: in the entrance whereunto you tell us, that from the *Monaſtery D.* Potter *is fled to an Hoſpital of perſons Univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, where he finds to be true, what you ſuppoſed, that, after his departure from his Brethren, he might fall into greater inconveniences, and more infectious diſeaſes than thoſe for which he left them.* Thus you. But, to deal truly with you, I find nothing of all this, nor how it is conſequent from any thing ſaid by you, or done by D. *Potter*. But this I find, that you have compoſed this your ſimilitude as you did the former, of a heap of vain Suſpitions, pretended to be grounded on our confeſſions. As firſt, that *your diſeaſes which we forſook, neither were nor could be mortal*: whereas we aſſure our ſelves and are ready to juſtifie, that they are and were mortal in themſelves, and would have been ſo to us, if, when *light came to us, we had loved darkneſs more than light*. And D. *Potter*, though he hope your Church wanted no neceſſary vital part, that is, that ſome in your Church by ignorance might be ſaved; yet he nothing doubts but that it is full of ulcers without, and diſeaſes within, and is far from ſo extenuating your errors as to make them only like the ſuperfluous fingers of the gyant of *Gath*. Secondly, *that we had no hope to avoyd other diſeaſes like thoſe for which we forſook your company, nor to be ſecure out of it from damnable errors*: whereas the hope hereof was the only motive of our departure; and we aſſure our ſelves that the means to be ſecured from damnable error, is not to be ſecure as you are, but carefully to uſe thoſe means of avoyding it, to which God hath promiſed, and will never fail to give a bleſſing. Thirdly, that *thoſe innumerable miſchiefs which followed upon the departure of Proteſtants, were cauſed by it as by a proper cauſe*: whereas their doctrin was no otherwiſe the occaſion of them, than the Goſpel of Chriſt of the diviſion of the world. The only fountain of all theſe miſchiefs, being indeed no other than your pouring out a flood of perſecutions againſt Proteſtants, only becauſe they would not ſin and be damn'd with you for company. Unleſs we may add the impatience of ſome Proteſtants, who not enduring to be torn in pieces like ſheep by a company of wolves without reſiſtance, chooſe rather to die like Souldiers than Martyrs.

93. But you proceed; and falling into a fit of admiration, crie out and ſay thus, *To what paſs hath Hereſie brought men, who bluſh not to compare the beloved Spouſe of the Lord, the only Dove*, &c. *to a Monaſtery that muſt be forſaken; to the gyant in Gath with ſuperfluous fingers*! But this *Spouſe of Chriſt*, this only *Dove*, this *purchaſe of our Saviours blood*, this *Catholick Church*, which you thus almoſt deifie, what is it but a Society of men, whereof every particular, and by conſequence, the whole company is or may be guilty

guilty of many sins daily committed against knowledge and conscience? Now I would fain understand why one error in faith, especially if not fundamental, should not consist with the holiness of this Spouse, this Dove, this Church, as well as many and great sins committed against knowledge and conscience? If this be not to strain at gnats and swallow camels, I would fain understand what it is! And here, by the way, I desire you to consider whether as it were with one stroke of a sponge you do not wipe out all that you have said, to prove Protestants Schismatiques for separating from your Church, though supposed to be in some errors not fundamental! *For if any such error may make her deserve to be compared to a Monastery so disordered that it must be forsaken*; then if you suppose (as here you do) your Church in such errors, your Church is so disordered that it must, and therefore without question may, be forsaken, I mean in those her disorders and corruptions, and no farther.

94. And yet you have not done with those similitudes, *But must observe* (you say) *one thing, and that is, That as these Reformers of the Monastery, and others who left the diseased company, could not deny but that they left the said communities: So* Luther *and the rest cannot pretend, not to have left the visible Church. And that D.* Potter *speaks very strangely when he sayes, In a society of men universally infected with some disease, they that should free themselves from the common disease, could not be therefore said to separate from the society. For if they do not separate themselves from the society of the infected persons, how do they free themselves from the common disease?* To which I answer: That indeed, if you speak of the Reformers of a Monastery and of the Desertors of the diseased company, as you put the cases, that is, of those which left these communities, then is it as true as Gospel, that they cannot deny but that they left the said communities. But it appears not to me, how it will ensue hereupon, That *Luther* and the rest cannot pretend not to have left the visible Church. For, to my apprehension, this argument is very weak,

> They which left some communities cannot truly deny but that they left them; therefore *Luther* and his followers cannot deny but that they left the visible Church.

Where, me-thinks, you prove little, but take for granted that which is one of the greatest Questions amongst us, that is, That the Company which *Luther* left, was the whole Visible Church: whereas you know we say, It was but a part of it, and that corrupted, and obstinate in her corruptions. Indeed, that *Luther* and his followers left off the Practice of those Corruptions wherein the whole Visible Church did communicate formerly, (which I meant when I acknowledg'd above that they forsook the external Communion of the Visible Church,) or that they left that part of the Visible Church in her corruptions which would not be reformed: These things, if you desire, I shall be willing to grant; and that, by a *Synecdoche* of the whole for the part, he might be said to forsake the Visible Church, that is, a part of it, and the greater part. But that, properly speaking, he forsook the whole Visible Church, I hope you will excuse me if I grant not this, until you bring better proof of it, than your former similitude. And my reason is this, because he and his Followers were a part of this Church, and ceased not to be so by the Reformation. Now he and his followers certainly forsook not themselves, Therefore not every part of the Church, Therefore not the whole

whole Church. But then if you ſpeak of D. *Potter*'s caſes, according as he put them, and anſwer not your own Arguments, when you make ſhew of anſwering his: me-thinks, it ſhould not be ſo unreaſonable as you make it, for the perſons he ſpeaks of to deny that they left the Communities whereof they were Members. For example, that the Monks of Saint *Benets* Order make one Body, wherof their ſeveral Monaſteries are ſeveral members, I preſume it will be eaſily granted. Suppoſe now, that all theſe Monaſteries being quite out of Order, ſome 20. or 30. of them ſhould reform themſelves, the reſt perſiſting ſtill in their irregular courſes: were it ſuch a monſtrous impudence as you make it, for theſe Monaſteries, which we ſuppoſe reformed, to deny that they forſook their Order or the Community whereof they were parts? In my Opinion it is no ſuch matter. Let the world judge. Again, whereas the Doctor ſaies, *that in a Society of men Vniverſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from the common diſeaſe, could not therefore be ſaid to ſeparate from the Society*: It is very ſtrange to me that you ſhould ſay, he ſpeaks very ſtrangely. Truly, Sir, I am extreamly deceived if his words be not plain Engliſh, and plain ſenſe, and contain ſuch a manifeſt Truth as cannot be denied with modeſty, nor gone about to be proved without vanity. For whatſoever is proved, muſt be proved by ſomething more evident: Now what can be more evident than this; That if ſome whole Family were taken with Agues, if the Father of this Family ſhould free himſelf from his, that he ſhould not therefore deſervedly be thought to abandon and diſert his Family? But (ſay you) if they dot no ſeparate themſelves from the Society of the wicked perſons, how do they free themſelves from the common diſeaſe? Do they at the ſame time remain in the company and yet depart from thoſe infected creatures? Me thinks, a Writer of Controverſies ſhould not be ignorant how this may be done without any ſuch difficulty! But if you do not know, I'le tell you, There is no neceſſity they ſhould leave the company of theſe infected perſons at all: much leſs, that they ſhould at once depart from it and remain with it, which I confeſs were very difficult. But if they will free themſelves from their diſeaſe, let them ſtay, were they are, and take phyſick. Or if you would be better informed how this ſtrange thing may be done, learn from your ſelf, *They may free their own perſons from the common diſeaſe, yet ſo that they remain ſtill in the company infected, eating and drinking with them, &c.* Which are your own words within four or five lines after this: plainly ſhewing that your miſtaking D. *Potter's* meaning, and your wondring at his words as at ſome ſtrange monſter's, was all this while affected, and that you are conſcious to your ſelf of perverting his Argument that you may ſeem to ſay ſomething, when indeed you ſay nothing. Whereas therefore you add, *We muſt then ſay that they ſeparate themſelves from the perſons, though it be by occaſion of the diſeaſe*; I aſſure you, good Sir, you muſt not do ſo at any hand; for then you alter and ſpoil D. *Potter*'s caſe quite, and fight not with his reaſon but your own ſhadow. For the Inſtance of *a man freeing himſelf from the diſeaſe of his company, and not leaving his company*, is very fit to prove, by the parity of reaſon, that it is very poſſible, a man may leave the corruptions of a Church, and not leave the Church, that is, not ceaſe to be a member of it: But yours *of a man leaving his company by occaſion of their diſeaſe*, hath no analogy at all with this buſineſs.

95. But

95. But *Luther and his followers did not continue in the company of those from whose diseases they pretend to free themselves.* Very true, neither was it said they did so. There is no necessity that that which is compared to another thing should agree with it in all things: it is sufficient, if it agree in that wherein it is compared. A man freeing himself from the common disease of a society, and yet continuing a part of it, is here compared to *Luther* and his followers, freeing themselves from the corruptions of the visible Church, and continuing a part of the Church. As for accompanying the other parts of it in all things, it was neither necessary, nor without destroying our supposition of their forsaking the corruptions of the Church, possible. Not necessary; for they may be parts of the Church which do not joyn with other parts of it in all observances. Nor possible, for had he accompanied them in all things, he had not freed himself from the common corruptions.

96. But *they indeavoured to force the society whereof they were parts, to be healed and reformed as they were; and, if it refused, they did, when they had power, drive them away, even their superiours both Spiritual and Temporal, as is notorious.* The proofs hereof are wanting, and therefore I might defer my answer untill they were produced; yet take this before hand: If they did so, then herein, in my opinion, they did amiss; for I have learnt from the ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more against Religion than to force Religion*; and of *S. Paul, The weapons of the Christian warfare are not carnal.* And great reason: For, humane violence may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, and is therefore fit for nothing but to breed form without, and Atheism within. Besides, if this means of bringing men to embrace any Religion were generally used (as if it may be justly used in any place by those that have power, and think they have truth, certainly they cannot with reason deny but that it may be used in every place, by those that have power as well as they, and think they have truth as well as they,) what could follow but the maintenance perhaps of truth, but perhaps only of the profession of it in one place, and the oppression of it in a hundred? What will follow from it but the preservation peradventure of unity, but peradventure only of uniformity, in particular States and Churches; but the immortalizing the greater & more lamentable divisions of Christendom and the world? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the judgement of carnal policy, the temporal benefit and tranquillity of temporal States and Kingdoms, but the infinite prejudice, if not the desolation, of the Kingdom of Christ? And therefore it well becomes them who have have their portions in this life, who serve no higher State than that of *England* or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither any further than they may serve themselves by it; who think of no other happiness but the preservation of their own fortunes and tranquillity in this world; who think of no other means to preserve States, but human power and Machivilian policy, and believe no other Creed but this, *Regi aut Civitati imperium habenti nihil injustum, quod utile!* Such men as these it may become to maintain by worldly power and violence their State-instrument, Religion. For if all be vain and false, (as in their judgment it is) the present whatsoever, is better than any, because it is already setled: an alteration of it may draw with it change of States, and the change of State the subversion of their fortune. But they that are indeed servants and lovers of Christ, of Truth, of the Church, and of Mankind, ought with all courage to oppose themselves against it, as a common enemy of all these.

They

They that know there is a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whoſe will and pleaſure Kings and Kingdoms ſtand and fall, they know, that to no King or State any thing can be profitable which is unjuſt; and that nothing can be more evidently unjuſt, than to force weak men by the profeſſion of a Religion which they believe not, to loſe their own eternal happineſs, out of a vain and needleſs fear, leſt they may poſſibly diſturb their temporal quietneſs. There being no danger to any State from any mans opinion; unleſs it be ſuch an opinion by which diſobedience to authority, or impiety, is taught or licenc'd: which ſort, I confeſs, may juſtly be puniſhed as well as other faults; or, unleſs this ſanguinary doctrin be joyn'd with it, That it is lawful for him by human violence to enforce others to it. Therefore if Proteſtants did offer violence to other mens conſciences and compel them to embrace their Reformation, I excuſe them not: much leſs, if they did ſo to the ſacred Perſons of Kings, and thoſe that were in authority over them, who ought to be ſo ſecur'd from violence, that even their unjuſt und tyrannous violence, though it may be avoided (according to that of our Saviour, *When they perſecute you in one City flie into another*,) yet may it not be reſiſted by oppoſing violence againſt it. Proteſtants therefore that were guilty of this crime are not to be excuſed, and bleſſed had they been had they choſen rather to be Martyrs than Murderers, & to die for their religion rather than to fight for it. But of all the men in the world you are moſt unfit to accuſe them hereof, againſt whom the ſouls of the Martyrs from under the Altar cry much lowder than againſt all their other Perſecutors together: Who for theſe many ages together have daily ſacrificed *Hecatombs* of innocent Chriſtians, under the name of Heretiques, to blind zeal and furious ſuperſtition. Who teach plainly, that you may propagate your Religion whenſoever you have power, by depoſing of Kings and invaſion of Kingdoms, and think when you kill the adverſaries of it, you *do God good ſervice*. But for their departing corporally from them, whom mentally they had forſaken: For their forſaking the external Communion and company of the unreformed part of the Church, in their ſuperſtitions and impieties: thus much of your accuſation we embrace and glory in it; And ſay, though ſome Proteſtants might offend in the maner or degree of their ſeparation, yet certainly their ſeparation it ſelf was not Schiſmatical, but innocent; and not only ſo, but juſt and neceſſary. And as for your obtruding upon D. *Potter* that he ſhould ſay, *There neither was nor could be juſt cauſe to do ſo, no more than to depart from Chriſt himſelf*. I have ſhewed divers times already, that you deal very injuriouſly with him, confounding together, *Departing from the Church*, and *Departing from ſome general opinions and practiſes*, which did not conſtitute but vitiate, not make the Church but marr it. For though he ſaies, that which is moſt true, that *there can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the Church*, that is, to ceaſe being a member of the Church, *no more than to depart from Chriſt himſelf*, in as much as theſe are not divers but the ſame thing; yet he nowhere denies, but there might be juſt and neceſſary cauſe to depart from ſome opinions and practices of your Church, nay of the Catholique Church. And therefore you do vainly to inferr, that, *Luther and his followers for ſo doing, were Schiſmatiques*.

97. *Ad Q.* 35. I anſwer in a word, that neither are *Optatus* his ſayings rules of Faith, and therefore not fit to determine Controverſies of Faith: And then that *Majorinus* might well be a Schiſmatique for departing from *Cæcilianus*,

Cæcilianus, and the Chayr of *Cyprian* and *Peter* without cause; and yet *Luther* and his followers who departed from the Communion of the Bishop of Rome, and the Bishop of their own Dioceſs be none, becauſe they had juſt and neceſſary cauſe of their departure. For otherwiſe they muſt have continued in the profeſſion of known Errors and the practice of manifeſt Corruptions.

98. *Ad* §. 36. In the next Section you tel us, that *Chriſt our Lord gave S.* Peter *and his ſucceſſors authority over his whole Militant Church*. And for proof hereof *you firſt referre us to* Brerely, *citing exactly the places of ſuch chief Proteſtants as have confeſſed the antiquity of this point*. Where firſt you fall into the Fallacy which is called *Ignoratio Elenchi*, or miſtaking the Queſtion; for being to prove this point true, you only prove it ancient. Which, to what purpoſe is it, when both the parties litigant are agreed that many errors were held by many of the ancient Doctors, much more ancient than any of thoſe who are pretended to be confeſſed by Proteſtants to have held with you in this matter: and when thoſe whom you have to do with, and whom it is vain to diſpute againſt but out of Principles received by them, are all peremptory, that though novelty be a certain note of falſhood, yet no Antiquity leſs than Apoſtolical, is a certain note of truth? Yet this I ſay, not as if I did acknowledge what you pretend, that Proteſtants did confeſs the Fathers againſt them in this point. For the point here iſſuable is not, Whether S. *Peter* were head of the Church? Nor, whether the Biſhop of *Rome* had any priority in the Church? Nor, whether he had authority over it given him by the Church? But whether by Divine right, and by Chriſts appointment he were Head of the Catholique Church? Now having peruſed *Brerely*, I cannot find any one Proteſtant confeſſing any one Father to have concurred in opinion with you in this point. And the Reader hath reaſon to ſuſpect, that you alſo out of all the Fathers could not find any one authority pertinent to this purpoſe: for otherwiſe you were much to blame, citing ſo few, to make choice of ſuch as are impertinent. For let the underſtanding Reader peruſe the 55. *Epiſt.* of *S. Cyprian*, with any ordinary attention, out of which you take your firſt place, and I am confident he ſhall find that he means nothing elſe by the words quoted by you, But that in one particular Church at one time there ought to be but one Biſhop, and that he ſhould be obeyed in all things lawful: The non-performance whereof, was one of the moſt ordinary cauſes of Hereſies againſt the Faith, and Schiſm from the Communion of the Church Univerſal. He ſhall find, ſecondly, and that by many convincing Arguments, that though he write to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, yet he ſpeaks not of him, but of himſelf then Biſhop of *Carthage*, againſt whom a faction of Schiſmatiques had then ſet up another. And therefore here your ingenuity is to be commended above many of your ſide: For whereas they ordinarily abuſe this place to prove, that in the whole Church there ought to be but one Prieſt & one Judge; you ſeem ſomwhat diffident hereof, and thereupon ſay, *That theſe words plainly condemn* Luther, *whether he will underſtand them as ſpoken of the Univerſal, or of every Particular Church*. But whether they condemn *Luther*, is another queſtion. The queſtion here is, Whether they plainly prove the Pope's Supremacy over all other Biſhops? which certainly they are as far from proving, as from proving the Supremacy of any other Biſhop: ſeeing it is evident they were intended not of

one Biſhop over the whole Catholique Church, but of one Biſhop in one particular Church.

99. And no leſs impertinent is your ſaying out of *Optatus*, if it be well look'd into, though at the firſt ſight it may ſeem otherwiſe; becauſe *Optatus* his ſtone happened to be *Rome*, whereas S. *Cyprians* was *Carthage*. The truth is, the Donatiſts had ſet up at *Rome* a Biſhop of their faction: not with intent to make him Biſhop of the whole Church but of that Church in particular. Now *Optatus* going upon S. *Cyprians* above-mentioned ground of *one Biſhop in one Church*, proves them Schiſmatiques for ſo doing, and he proves it by this Argument: S. *Peter* was firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, neither did the Apoſtles attribute to themſelves each one his particular Chair, (underſtand *in that City*; for in other places others, I hope, had Chairs beſides S. *Peter*) and therefore he is a Schiſmatique, who againſt that one ſingle Chair erects another (underſtand as before, *in that place*) making another Biſhop of that Dioceſs beſides him who was lawfully elected to it.

100. But *yet by the way he ſtyles S.* Peter *head of the Apoſtles, and ſays, that from thence he was called* Cephas. *Anſ.* Perhaps he was abuſed into this opinion, by thinking *Cephas* derived from the *Greek* word Κεφαλὴ *a head*; whereas it is a *Syriack* word and ſignifies *a ſtone*. Beſides, S. *Peter* might be head of the Apoſtles, that is, firſt in order and honour among them, and not have Supreme Authority over them. And indeed that S. *Peter* ſhould have Authority over all the Apoſtles, and yet exerciſe no one act of Authority over any one of them, and that they ſhould ſhew to him no ſign of ſubjection, me-thinks is as ſtrange, as that a King of *England* for twenty five years together ſhould do no Act of Regality, nor receive any one acknowledgement of it. As ſtrange methinks it is, that you, ſo many ages after, ſhould know this ſo certainly, as you pretend to do, and that the Apoſtles (after that thoſe words were ſpoken in their hearing, by vertue whereof S. *Peter* is pretended to have been made their head,) ſhould ſtill be ſo ignorant of it, as to queſtion *which of them ſhould be the greateſt?* yet more ſtrange, that our Saviour ſhould not bring them out of their error, by telling them S. *Peter* was the man, but rather confirm it by ſaying, *the Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe authority over them, but it ſhould not be ſo among them.* No leſs a wonder was it that S. *Paul* ſhould ſo far forget S. *Peter* and himſelf, as that, firſt mentioning of him often, he ſhould do it without any title of Honour. Secondly, ſpeaking of the ſeveral degrees of men in the Church, he ſhould not give S. *Peter* the higheſt, but place him in equipage with the reſt of the Apoſtles, and ſay, *God hath appointed* (not *firſt Peter, then the reſt* of the Apoſtles, but) *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets.* Certainly, if the Apoſtles were *all firſt*, to me it is very probable, that no one of them was before the reſt. For by *Firſt*, all men underſtand either that which is before all, or that before which is nothing. Now in the former ſenſe, the Apoſtles could not be all firſt, for then every one of them muſt have been before every one of the reſt. And therefore they muſt be *Firſt* in the other ſenſe. And therefore No man, and therefore Not S. *Peter*, muſt be before any of them. Thirdly and Laſtly, that ſpeaking of himſelf in particular, and perhaps comparing himſelf with S. *Peter* in particular, rather than any other, he ſhould ſay in plain terms, *I am in nothing inferior to the very chiefeſt Apoſtles.* But beſides all this, Though we ſhould grant, againſt all theſe probabilities and many more, that *Optatus* meant that S. *Peter* was head of the Apoſtles,

not

not in our but in your ſenſe, and that S. *Peter* indeed was ſo; yet ſtill you are very farr from ſhewing, that in the judgement of *Optatus*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, was to be at all, much leſs by divine right, ſucceſſor to S. *Peter* in this his Headſhip and Authority. For what incongruity is there, if we ſay, that he might ſucceed S. *Peter* in that part of his care, the government of that particular Church, (as ſure he did even while S. *Peter* was living,) and yet that neither he nor any man was to ſucceed him in his Apoſtleſhip, nor in his government of the Church Univerſal? Eſpecially ſeeing S. *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles, by laying the foundations of the Church, were to be the *Foundations of it*, and accordingly are ſo called in Scripture. And therefore as in a Building it is incongruous that Foundations ſhould ſucceed Foundations: So it may be in the Church, that any other Apoſtles ſhould ſucceed the firſt.

101. *Ad §.* 37. The next Paragraph I might well paſs over, as having no Argument in it. For there is nothing in it but two ſayings of S. *Auſtin*, which I have great reaſon to eſteem no Argument, untill you will promiſe me, to grant whatſoever I ſhall prove by two ſayings of S. *Auſtin*. But moreover, the ſecond of theſe ſentences ſeems to me, to imply the contradiction of the firſt. For to ſay, *That the Sacriledge of Schiſm, is eminent, when there is no cauſe of ſeparation*, implies, to my underſtanding, that there may be a cauſe of Separation. Now in the firſt, he ſays plainly, *That this is impoſſible*. Neither doth any reconciliation of his words occurre to me, but only this, that in the former he ſpeaks upon ſuppoſition, that the Publique ſervice of God, wherein men are to communicate is unpolluted, and no unlawful thing practiced in their communion, which was ſo true of their communion, that the Donatiſts who ſeparated did not deny it. And to make this anſwer no improbable evaſion, it is obſervable out of S. *Auſtin* and *Optatus*, that though the Donatiſts, at the beginning of their Separation, pretended no cauſe of it, but only that the men from whom they ſeparated, were defiled with the contagion of Traditors; yet afterwards, to make the continuance of it more juſtifiable, they did invent and ſpread abroad this calumny againſt Catholiques, that they ſet pictures upon their altars: which when S. *Auſtin* comes to Anſwer, he does not deny the poſsibility of the thing, for that had been to deny the Catholique Church to be made up of men, all which had free-will to evil, and therefore might poſsibly agree in doing it, and, had he denyed this, the Action of after-Ages had been his refutation; Neither does he ſay, (as you would have done,) that it was true, they placed pictures there, and moreover worſhipped them, but yet not for their own ſakes, but for theirs who were repreſented by them: Neither does he ſay, (as you do in this Chapter) that though this were granted a Corruption, yet were they not to ſeparate for it. What then does he? Certainly nothing elſe, but abhorr the thing, and deny the imputation: Which way of anſwering, does not, I confeſs, plainly ſhew, but yet it ſomewhat intimates, that he had nothing elſe to anſwer; and that if he could not have denyed this, he could not have denyed the Donatiſts ſeparation from them to have been juſt. If this Anſwer to this litle Argument ſeem not ſufficient, I add moreover, that if it be applyed to *Luther*'s ſeparation, it hath the common fault of all your Allegations out of Fathers, Impertinence. For it is one thing to ſeparate from the communion of the whole world, another to ſeparate form all the Communions in the world: One thing to

divide from them who are united among themſelves, another to divide from them who are divided among themſelves. Now the Donatiſts ſeparated from the whole world of Chriſtians, united in one Communion, profeſſing the ſame Faith, ſerving God after the ſame maner, which was a very great Argument, that they could not have juſt cauſe to leave them: according to that of *Tertullian*, *Variâſſe debuerat error Eccleſiarum; quod autem apud multos unum eſt, non eſt Erratum ſed Traditum.* But *Luther* and his ſol'owers did not ſo. The world, I mean of Chriſtians and Catholiques, was divided and ſubdivided long before he divided from it; and by their diviſions had much weakned their own authority, and taken away from you this plea of S. *Auſtin*, which ſtands upon no other Foundation, but the Unity of the whole worlds Communion.

102. *Ad §.* 38. If *Luther were in the right, moſt certain thoſe Proteſtants that differed from him were in the wrong:* But that either he or they were Schiſmatiques, it follows not. Or if it does, then either the Jeſuits are Schiſmatiques from the Dominicans, or they from the Jeſuits; The Canoniſts from the Jeſuits, or the Jeſuits from the Canoniſts: The Scotiſts from the Thomiſts, or they from the Scotiſts: The Franciſcans from the Dominicans, or the Dominicans from the Franciſcans. For between all theſe the world knows that, in point of Doctin, there is a plain and irreconcileable contradiction; and therefore one Part muſt be in error, at leaſt not Fundamental. Thus your Argument returns upon your ſelf, and, if it be good, proves the *Roman* Church in a manner to be made up of Schiſmatiques. But the anſwer to it, is, that it begges this very falſe and vain Suppoſition; That whoſoever in any point of doctrin is a Schiſmatique.

103. *Ad §.* 39. In the next place you number up your victories, and tell us, *that out of theſe premiſes, this concluſion follows, That* Luther *and his followers were Schiſmatiques from the Viſible Church, the Pope, the Dioceſs wherein they were baptized; from the Biſhop under whom they lived, from the Countrey to which they belonged; from their Religious order, wherein they were profeſſed; from one another, and laſtly, from a mans ſelf: Becauſe the ſelf ſame Proteſtant is convicted to day, that his yeſterdayes opinion was an error.* To which I Anſwer, that *Luther* and his followers ſeparated from many of theſe, in ſome opinions and practices: But that they did it without cauſe, which only can make them Schiſmatiques, that was the only thing you ſhould have prov'd, and to that you have not urged one reaſon of any moment. All of them for weight and ſtrength were coſen-germans to this pretty device, wherewith you will prove them Schiſmatiques from themſelves, *becauſe the ſelf ſame Proteſtant to day is convicted in conſcience, that his yeſterdayes opinion was an error.* It ſeems then, that they that hold errors, muſt hold them faſt, and take ſpecial care of being convicted in conſcience that they are in error, for fear of being Schiſmatiques! Proteſtants muſt continue Proteſtants, and Puritans Puritans, and Papiſts Papiſts; nay Jewes, and Turks, and Pagans, muſt remain Jews, and Turks, and Pagans, and go on conſtantly to the Devil, or elſe, forſooth, they muſt be *Schiſmatiques* and that *from themſelves*. And this perhaps is the cauſe that makes Papiſts ſo obſtinate, not only in their common ſuperſtition but alſo in adhering to the proper phancies of their ſeveral Sects: ſo that it is a miracle to hear of any Jeſuit that hath forſaken the opinion of the Jeſuits, or any Dominican that hath chang'd his for the Jeſuits. Whithout queſtion, this Gentleman my adverſary knows

knows none such, or else methinks he should not have objected it to D. *Potter*, *That he knew a man in the world, who, from a Puritan, was turned to a moderate Protestant*, which is likely to be true. But sure, if this be all his fault, he hath no reason to be ashamed of his acquaintance. For possibly it may be a fault to be in errour, because many times it proceeds from a fault: But sure, the forsaking of errour cannot be a sin, unless to be in errour be a vertue. And therefore to do as you do, to damn men for false opinions, and to call them Schismatiques for leaving them; to make pertinacy in errour, that is, an unwillingness to be convicted, or a resolution not to be convicted, the form of Heresie, and to find fault with men, for being convicted in conscience that they are in error, is the most incoherent and contradictious injustice that ever was heard of. But Sir, if this be a strange matter to you, that which I shall tell you will be much stranger. I know a man that of a moderate Protestant turn'd a Papist, and, the day that he did so, (as all things that are done are perfected some day or other,) was convicted in Conscience, that his yesterdays opinion was an errour, and yet thinks he was no Schismatique for doing so, and desires to be informed by you, whether or no he was mistaken? The same man afterwards, upon better consideration, became a doubting Papist, and of a doubting Papist a confirm'd Protestant. And yet this man thinks himself no more to blame for all these changes, than a Travailer, who using all diligence to find the right way to some remote City, where he had never been, (as the party I speak of had never been in Heaven,) did yet mistake it, and after find his error, and amend it. Nay, he stands upon his justification so far as to maintain that his alterations, not only to you, but also from you by Gods mercy, were the most satisfactory actions to himself, that ever he did, and the greatest victories that ever he obtained over himself, and his affections to those things which in this world are most pretious; as wherein for Gods sake, and (as he was verily perswaded,) out of love to the Truth, he went; upon a cerain expectation of those inconveniences, which to ingenuous natures are of all most terrible. So that though there were much weakness in some of these alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedness. Neither does he yield his weakness altogether without Apologie, seeing his deductions were rational, and out of some Principles commonly received by Protestants as well as Papists, and which by his education had got possession of his understanding.

104 *Ad Q.* 40, 41. D. *Potter* p. 81. of his Book, to prove our Separation from you, not only lawful but necessary, hath these words, *Although we confess the Church of* Rome, *(in some sense) to be a true Church, and her errours* (to some men) *not damnable; yet for us who are convinced in conscience, that she errs in many things, a necessity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forsake her in those errours.* He means not, in the belief of those errours; for that is presupposed to be done already: for whosoever is convinc'd in Conscience that she errs, hath for matter of belief forsaken, that is, ceased to believe those errours. This therefore he meant not, nor could not mean: but that, whosoever is convinc'd in Conscience that the Church of *Rome* erres, cannot with a good conscience, but forsake her in the profession and practice of these errours: And the reason hereof is manifest; because otherwise, he must profess what he believes not, and practise what he approves not. Which is no more than your self in *these* have

divers times affirmed. For in one place, you ſay, *It is unlawful to ſpeak any the leaſt untruth*: Now he that profeſſeth your Religion, and believes it not, what elſe doth he but live in a perpetual lie? Again in another, *you have called them that profeſs one thing and believe another, a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants:* And therefore in inveighing againſt Proteſtants for forſaking the Profeſſion of theſe errours, the belief whereof they had already forſaken, what do you but rail at them for not being a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants?* And laſtly, §. 42. of this Chapter, within three leaves after this, whereas D. *Potter grants but only a neceſſity of peaceable external obedience to the Declaration of the Church, though perhaps erroneous, (provided it be in matter not of Faith, but of Opinions or Rites,)* condemning thoſe men, who by occaſion of errours of this quality, diſturb the Churches peace, and caſt off her Communion: Upon this occaſion you come upon him with this bitter Sarcaſm, *I thank you for your ingenuous confeſſion, in recompence whereof I will do a deed of Charity, by putting you in mind into what Labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may err in ſome points of Faith, and yet that it is not lawful for any man to oppoſe his judgment, or leave her Communion, though he have evidence of Scripture againſt her! Will you have ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his Conſcience, or externally deny Truth known to be contained in holy Scripture?* I anſwer for him, No: It is not he, but you, that would have men do ſo: not he who ſays plainly, that *whoſoever is convinc'd in Conſcience that any Church errs, is bound under pain of damnation to forſake her in her profeſſion and practice of theſe errours:* but you, who find fault with him, and make long diſcourſes againſt him, for thus affirming: Not he who can eaſily wind himſelf out of your Imaginary Labyrinth, by telling you, that he no where denyes it lawful for any man to oppoſe any Church, erring in matter of Faith, for that he ſpeaks not of matters of Faith at all, but only *of Rites and Opinions.* And in ſuch matters, he ſayes indeed at firſt, *It is not lawful for any man to oppoſe his judgment to the publique:* But he preſently explains himſelf by ſaying, not only that he *may hold an opinion contrary to the publique reſolution, but beſides that he may offer it to be conſidered of,* (ſo far is he from requiring any ſinful diſſimulation); *Provided, he do it with great Probability of Reaſon, very modeſtly and reſpectfully*, and without ſeparation from the Churches Communion. It is not therefore in this caſe, oppoſing a mans private judgment to the publique ſimply, which the Doctor finds fault with: But the degree only and malice of this Oppoſition, *oppoſing it factiouſly.* And not holding a mans own conceit, different from the Church abſolutely, which here he cenſures: But a *factious advancing it, and deſpiſing the Church, ſo farr as to caſt off her Communion*, becauſe, forſooth, ſhe errs in ſome opinion, or uſeth ſome inconvenient, though not impious Rites and Ceremonies. Little reaſon therefore have you to accuſe him there, as if he required, *That men ſhould diſſemble againſt their Conſcience, or externally deny a truth known to be contained in holy Scripture.* But certainly a great deal leſs, to quarrel with him, for ſaying (which is all that here he ſays,) That *men under pain of damnation, are not to diſſemble, but if they be convinc'd in conſcience, that your, or any other Church* (for the reaſon is alike for all) *errs in many things, are of neceſſity to forſake that Church, in the Profeſſion and practice of thoſe errours.*

105. But to conſider your exception to this ſpeech of the Doctors, ſomewhat

what more particularly: I say your whole discourse against it, is compounded of *falshoods* and *impertinencies*. The first falshood is, that he in these words avoucheth, *that no learned Catholiques can be saved:* Unless you will suppose, that all learned Catholiques are convinc'd in conscience, that your Church errs in many things. It may well be fear'd that many are so convinc'd, and yet profess what they believe not. Many more have been, and have stifled their consciences, by thinking it an act of humility, to do so. Many more would have been, had they with liberty and indifference of judgement, examined the grounds of the Religion which they profess. But to think that all the Learned of your side, are actually convinc'd of errors in your Church, and yet will not forsake the profession of them, this is so great an uncharitableness, that I verily believe D. *Potter* abhorres it. Your next falshood is, *That the Doctor affirms, that you Catholiques want no means of Salvation*: and that he judges *the Roman errors not to be in themselves fundamental or damnable*. Which calumny I have very often confuted: and in this very place it is confuted by D. *Potter*, and confessed by your self. For in the beginning of this Answer you tell us, that the *Doctor avouches of all Catholiques whom ignorance cannot excuse, that they cannot be saved.* Certainly then he must needs esteem them to want something necessary to Salvation. And then in the Doctor's saying, it is remarkable, that he confesses, *your errors to some men not damnable*: which cleerly imports, that according to his judgement, they were damnable in themselves, though by accident to them who lived and died in invincible ignorance, and with repentance, they might prove not damnable. A Third is, that these *Assertions, the Roman Errors are in themselves not damnable, and yet it is damnable for me (who know them to be errors,) to hold and confess them, are absolutely inconsistent*; which is false; for, be the matter what it will, yet for a man to tell a lie, especially in matter of Religion, cannot but be damnable. How much more then, to go on in a course of lying by professing to believe these things divine Truths, which he verily believes to be falshoods and fables? A fourth is, that *if we erred in thinking that your Church holds errors, this error or erroneous conscience might be rectified and deposed, by judging those errors not damnable*. For, what repugnance is there between these two Suppositions, that, you do hold some errors, and, that they are not damnable? And if there be no repugnance between them, how can the belief of the later remove or destroy, or it be erroneous, rectifie the belief of the former? Nay seeing there is a manifest consent between them, how can it be avoided, but the belief of the later will maintain and preserve the belief of the former? For who can conjoyn in one brain not crackt, (pardon me, if I speak to you in your own words,) these Assertions, In the *Roman* Church there are errors not damnable; and, In the *Roman* Church there are no errors at all? Or what sober understanding would ever think this a good collection, I esteem the errors of the *Roman* Church not damnable, therefore I do amiss to think that she erres at all? If therefore you would have us alter our judgement, that your Church is erroneous; your only way is to shew, your doctrin consonant, at least not evidently repugnant, to Scripture and Reason. For as for this device, this short cut of perswading our selves that you hold no errors, because we believe your errors are not damnable, assure your self it will never hold.

106. A fifth falſhood is, *That we daily do this favour for Proteſtants* you muſt mean (if you ſpeak conſequently) to judge *they have no errors, becauſe we judge they have none damnable.* Which the world knows to be moſt untrue. And for our continuing in their communion notwithſtanding their errors, the juſtification hereof is not ſo much, that their errors are not damble: as that they require not the belief and profeſſion of theſe errors among the conditions of their communion. Which puts a main difference between them and you: becauſe we may continue in their communion without profeſſing to believe their opinions, but in yours we cannot. A ſixt is, that, according to the *Doctrin of all Divines, there is any difference between a Speculative perſwaſion of conſcience, of the unlawfulneſs of any thing, and a Practical Dictamen that the ſame thing is unlawful.* For theſe are but diverſe words ſignifying the ſame thing; neither is ſuch perſwaſion wholly ſpeculative, but tending to practice: nor ſuch a dictamen wholly practical, but grounded upon ſpeculation. A ſeventh is, *That Proteſtants did only conceive in ſpeculation that the Church of* Rome *erred in ſome doctrins*, and had not alſo a practical dictamen, that it was damnable for them to continue in the profeſſion of theſe errors. An eighth is, that *it is not lawful to ſeparate from any Churches communion, for errors not appertaning to the ſubſtance of Faith*: Which is not univerſally true, but with this exception, unleſs that Church requires the belief and profeſſion of them. The ninth is, that D. *Potter teacheth, that* Luther *was bound to forſake the houſe of God, for an unneceſſary light.* Confuted manifeſtly by D. *Potter* in this very place, for by the houſe of God you mean the *Roman* Church, and of her the Doctor ſaies, *That a neceßity did lie upon him, even under pain of damnation, to forſake the Church of* Rome *in her errors.* This ſure is not to ſay, that he was obliged to forſake her, for an unneceſſary light. The tenth is covertly vented in your intimation, *That* Luther *and his followers were the proper cauſe of the Chriſtian worlds Combuſtion*: Whereas indeed the true cauſe of this lamentable effect, was your violent perſecution of them, for ſerving God according to their conſcience, which if it be done to you, you condemn of horrible impiety, and therefore may not hope to be excuſed, if you do it to others.

107. The eleventh is, that our *firſt reformers ought to have doubted whether their opinions were certain.* Which is to ſay, that they ought to have doubted of the certainty of Scripture: which in formal and expreſs terms, contains many of theſe opinions And the reaſon of this aſſertion is very vain: *for though they had not an abſolute infallibility promiſed unto them*, yet may they be of ſome things infallibly certain. As *Euclide* ſure was not infallible, yet was he certain enough, that *twice two were four*, and *that every whole was greater than a part of that whole.* And ſo though *Calvin* and *Melanchon* were not infallible in all things, yet they might and did know well enough, that your Latine Service was condemned by Saint *Paul*, and that the Communion in both kinds was taught by our Saviour. The twelfth and laſt is this, that *your Church was in peaceable poſſeſſion* you muſt mean of her Doctrin, and the Profeſſors of it,) *and enjoyed preſcription for many ages.* For, beſides that Doctrin is not a thing that may be poſſeſſed: And the profeſſors of it were the Church it ſelf, and in nature of poſſeſſors, (If we ſpeak improperly,) rather than the thing poſſeſſed, with whom no man hath reaſon to be offended, if they think fit to quit their own poſſeſſion: I ſay that the poſſeſſion, which the governours of your Church held for ſome

ages,

ages, of the party governed, was not peaceable, but got by fraud, and held by violence.

108. These are the *Falshoods* which in this Answer offer themselves to any attentive Reader, and that which remains is meer *impertinence*. As first, that *a pretence of conscience will not serve to justifie Separation, from being Schismatical*. Which is true, but little to the purpose, seeing it was not an erroneous perswasion much less an Hypocritical pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of conscience, which D. *Potter* alleaged to justifie Protestants from being Schismatical. And therefore though seditious men in Church and State, may pretend conscience, for a cloak of their rebellion: yet this, I hope, hinders not, but that an honest man ought to obey his rightly informed conscience, rather than the unjust commands of his tyrannous Superiours. Otherwise, With what colour can you defend either your own refusing the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy? or the ancient Martyrs, and Apostles, and Prophets, who oftentimes disobeyed the commands of men in authority, and for their disobedience made no other but this Apology, *We must obey God rather than men?* It is therefore most apparent that this answer must be meerly impertinent: seeing it will serve against the Martyrs and Apostles and Prophets, and even against your selves, as well as against Protestants. To as little purpose is your rule out of *Lyrinensis* against them that followed *Luther*, seeing they pretend and are ready to justifie, that they forsook not, with the Doctors, the faith, but only the corruption of the Church. As vain altogether is that which followes: That *in cases of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superiour, or cast off his obedience, nor publiquely oppose his decrees*. From whence it will follow very evidently, that seeing it is not a matter of faith, but disputed question amongst you, Whether the Oath of Allegeance be lawful: that either you acknowledge not the King your Superior, or do against conscience, in opposing his and the Kingdoms decree, requiring the taking of this Oath. This good use, I say, may very fairly be made of it, and is by men of your religion. But then it is so far from being a confutation, that it is rather a confirmation of D. *Potter*'s assertion. For he that useth these words, Doth he not plainly import (and such was the case of Protestants) that we are to leave our Superiours, to cast off obedience to them, and publiquely, to oppose their Decrees, when we are certain (as Protestants were,) that what they command, God doth countermand. Lastly, S. *Cyprians* example is against Protestants impertinently, and even ridiculously, alleadged. *For, what if S. Cyprian holding his opinion true but not necessary, condemned no man (much less any Church) for holding the contrary?* Yet, me thinks, this should lay no obligation upon *Luther* to do so likwise: seeing he held his own opinions not only true but also necessary, and the doctrin of the *Roman* Church not only false but damnable. And therefore seeing the condition and state of the parties censured by S. *Cyprian* and *Luther* was so different, no marvel though their censures also were different according to the supposed merit of the parties delinquent. For as for your obtruding again upon us, *That we believe the points of difference not Fundamental or necessary*, you have been often told, that it is a Calumny. We hold your errors as damnable in themselves as you do ours, only by accident through invincible ignorance, we hope they are not unpardonable: and you also profess to think the same of ours.

109. *Ad*

109. *Ad §.* 42. The former part of this diſcourſe, grounded on D. *Potter*'s words *p.* 105. I have already in paſſing examined and confuted: I add in this place, 1. That though the Doctor ſay, *It is not fit for any private man to oppoſe his judgement to the publique*; that is, his own judgement and bare authority: yet he denies not, but occaſions may happen wherein it may be warrantable, to oppoſe his reaſon or the authority of Scripture againſt it; and is not then to be eſteem'd to oppoſe his own judgement to the publique, but the judgement of God to the judgement of men. Which his following words ſeem to import, *He may offer his opinion to be conſidered of, ſo he do it with evidence or great probability of Scripture or Reaſon.* Secondly, I am to tell you that you have no ground from him, to enterline his words with that Interrogatory (*his own conceits, and yet grounded upon evidence of Scripture?*) For theſe things are in his words oppoſed, and not confounded; and the latter, not intended for a repetition (as you miſtake it) but for an Antitheſis of the former. *He may offer* (ſaith he) *his opinion to be conſidered of, ſo he do it with evidence of Scripture. But if he will factiouſly advance his own conceits* (that is, ſay I, clean contrary to your gloſs,) *Such as have not evident nor very probable ground in Scripture,* (for theſe conceits are properly his own) *he may juſtly be branded, &c.* Now that this of the two is the better gloſs, it is proved by your own interrogation. For that imputes abſurdity to D. *Potter*, for calling them a mans *own conceits*, which were *grounded upon evidence of Scripture.* And therefore you have ſhewed little candour or equity, in faſtening upon them this abſurd conſtruction: They not only bearing, but even requiring another more fair and more ſenſible. Every man ought to be preſum'd to ſpeak ſenſe, rather than non-ſenſe; coherently, rather than contradictiouſly; if his words be fairly capable of a better conſtruction. For M. *Hooker*; if, writing againſt Puritans, he had ſaid ſomething unawares that might give advantage to Papiſts, it were not inexcuſable: ſeeing it is a matter of ſuch extream difficulty, to hold ſuch a temper in oppoſing one extream opinion, as not to ſeem to favour the other. Yet if his words be rightly conſider'd, there is nothing in them that will do you any ſervice. For though he ſaies that *men are bound to do whatſoever the ſentence of finall Deciſion ſhall determin*, as it is plain men are bound to yield ſuch an obedience to all Courts of civil judicature: yet he ſaies not, they *are bound to think* that determination lawful, and that ſentence juſt. Nay it is plain he ſaies, that they *muſt do according to the Judge's ſentence, though in their private opinion it ſeem unjuſt.* As if I be caſt wrongfully in a ſuit at law, and ſentenced to pay an hundred pound, I am bound to pay the mony; yet I know no law of God or man, that binds me in conſcience to acquit the Judge of error in his ſentence. The queſtion therefore being only what men ought to think, it is vain for you to tell us what M. *Hooker* ſaies at all. For M. *Hooker*, though an excellant man, was but a man. And much more vain, to tell us out of him, what men ought to do, for point of external obedience. When, in the very ſame place, he ſuppoſeth and alloweth, that in their private opinion they may think, This ſentence to which they yield a paſsive obedience, to ſwarve utterly from that which is right. If you will draw his words to ſuch a conſtruction, as if he had ſaid, *they muſt think the ſentence of judicial and final deciſion juſt and right, though it ſeem in their private opinion to ſwerve utterly from what is right*; It is manifeſt, you make him contradict himſelf, and make him ſay in effect, They muſt think thus, though at the ſame time they think

the

the contrary. Neither is there any *necessity, that he must either acknowledge the universal infallibility of the Church, or drive men into dissembling against their conscience*, seeing nothing hinders, but I may obey the sentence of a Judge, paying the money he awards me to pay, or forgoing the house or land which he hath judged from me, and yet withall plainly profess, that in my conscience I conceive his judgement erroneous. To which purpose, they have a saying in *France*, that *whosoever is cast in any cause, hath liberty for ten daies after, to rayl at his Judges.*

110. This answer to this place, the words themselves offered me, even as they are alleaged by you: But upon perusal of the place in the Author himself, I find that here, as else-where, you and M. *Brerely* wrong him extreamly. For, mutilating his words, you make him say that absolutely, which he there expresly limits to some certain cases. *In litigious and controverted causes of such a quality* (saith he), *the will of God is, to have them do whatsoever the sentence of judicial and final Decision shall determine.* Observe, I pray, He saies not absolutely and in all causes, this is the will of God: But only *in litigious causes, of the quality of those whereof he there entreats.* In such matters, as have plain Scripture or Reason, neither for them nor against them; and wherein men are perswaded this or that way, *Upon their own only probable collection*; In such cases, *This perswasion* (saith he) *ought so be fully setled in mens hearts, that the will of God is, that they should not disobey the certain commands of their lawful superiours, upon uncertain grounds: But do that which the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determine.* For the purpose, a Question there is, Whether a Surplice may be worn in Divine service: The Authority of Superiours injoynes this Ceremony, and neither Scripture nor Reason plainly forbids it. *Sempronius* notwithstanding, is, by some inducements, which he confesses to be only probable, led to this perswasion, that the thing is unlawful. The *quare* is, Whether he ought for matter of practice to follow the injunction of authority, or his own private and only probable perswasion? M. *Hooker* resolves for the former, upon this ground, that *the certain commands of the Church we live in, are to be obeyed in all things, not certainly unlawful.* Which rule is your own, and by you extended to the commands of all Superiors, in the very next Section before this, in these words, *In cases of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superior, nor cast off his obedience, or publiquely oppose his decrees.* And yet, if a man should conclude upon you, that either you make all Superiors universally infallible, or else drive men into perplexities and labyrinths of doing against conscience, I presume you would not think your self fairly dealt with; but alleage, that your words are not extended to all cases, but limited *to cases of uncertainty.* As little therefore ought you to make this deduction from M. *Hooker*'s words which are appparently also restrained to *cases of uncertainty.* For as for requiring a blind and an unlimited obedience, to Ecclesiastical decisions universally and in all cases, even when plain Texts or reason seems to controle them, M. *Hooker* is as far from making such an Idol of Ecclesiastical Authority, as the Puritans whom he writes against: *I grant* (saith he) *that proof derived from the authority of mans judgment, is not able to work that assurance which doth grow by a stronger proof. And therefore although ten thousand General Councils would set down one and the same definitive Sentence, concerning any point of Religion whatsoever; yet one demonstrative Reason alleaged, or one manifest Testimony cited from the Word of*

God

God himself, to the contrary, could not chuse, but over-weigh them all: in as much as for them to be deceived, it is not impossible; it is, that Demonstrative Reason, or Divine Testimony, should deceive. And again, *Whereas it is thought, that, especially with the Church, and those that are called, man's authority ought not to prevail. It must and doth prevail even with them, yea with them especially, as far as equity requireth, and farther we maintain it not. For men to be tyed and led by authority, as it were with a kind of captivity of judgment and, though there be reason to the contrary, not to listen to it, but follow like Beasts, the first in the Heard, this were brutish.* Again, *That authority of men should prevail with men either against or above reason, is no part of our belief. Companies of learned men, be they never so great and reverend, are to yield unto reason, the weight whereof, is no whit prejudic'd by the simplicity of his person which doth alleage it; but being found to be sound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary, must of necessity stoop & give place.* Thus M. *Hooker* in his 7. Sect. Book 2. which place because it is far distant from that which is alleaged by you, the oversight of it might be excusable, did you not impute it to D. *Potter* as a fault, that he cites some clauses of some Books, without reading the whole. But besides, in that very Sect. out of which you take this corrupted sentence, he hath very pregnant words to the same effect: *as for the orders established, sith equity & reason favour that which is in being, till orderly judgment of decision be given against it; it is but justice to exact of you, and perverseness in you it should be to deny thereunto your willing obedience. Not that I judg it a thing allowable, for men to observe those Laws, which in their hearts they are stedfastly perswaded, to be against the Law of God: But your perswasion in this case, ye are all bound for the time to suspend; and, in otherwise doing, ye offend against God, by troubling his Church without just and necessary cause. Be it that there are some reasons inducing you to think hardly of our Laws: Are those Reasons demonstrative, are they necessary, or but meer probabilities only? An argument necessary and demonstrative is such, as, being proposed to any man and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent. Any one such reason dischargeth, I grant, the Conscience, and setteth it at full liberty. For the publique approbation given by the body of this whole Church, unto those things which are established, doth make it but probable that they are good. And therefore unto a necessary proof that they are not good, it must give place.* This plain declaration of his judgment in this matter, this expres limitation of his former resolution, he makes in the very same Section, which affords your former quotation; and therefore what Apology can be made for you, and your Store-house M. *Brerely*, for dissembling of it, I cannot possibly imagine.

III. D. *Potter* p. 131. sayes, *That errors of the* Donatists *and* Novatians, *were not in themselves Heresies, nor could be made so by the Churches determination. But that the Churches intention was only to silence disputes, and to settle peace and unity in her government: which because they factiously opposed, they were justly esteemed Schismatiques. From hence you conclude that the same condemnation must pass against the first Reformers, seeing they also opposed the commands of the Church, imposed on them, for silencing all Disputes, and setling Peace and Unity in Government.* But this Collection is deceitful, and the reason is: Because, though the first Reformers, as well as the *Donatists* and *Novatians*, opposed herein the Commands of the Visible Church, that is, of a great part of it: yet the Reformers had reason, nay necessity

ceſſity to do ſo, the Church being then corrupted with damnable errors: which was not true of the Church, when it was oppoſed by the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*. And therefore though they, and the Reformers, did the ſame action, yet doing it upon different grounds, it might in theſe merit applauſe, and in them condemnation.

112 *Ad §.* 43. The next §. hath in it ſome objections againſt *Luther*'s perſon, and none againſt his cauſe, which alone I have undertaken to juſtifie, and therefore I paſs it over. Yet this I promiſe, that when you, or any of your ſide, ſhall publiſh a good defence, of all that your Popes have ſaid and done, eſpecially of them whom *Bellarmine* believes, in ſuch a long train *to have gone to the Divel*: then you ſhall receive an ample Apology for all the actions and words of *Luther*. In the mean time, I hope, all reaſonable and equitable judges, will eſteem it not unpardonable in the great and Heroical ſpirit of *Luther*, if, being oppoſed, and perpetually baited with a world of Furies, he were tranſported ſometimes, and made ſomewhat furious. As for you, I deſire you to be quiet, and to demand no more, whether God be wont to ſend ſuch Furies to preach the Goſpel? Unleſs you deſire to hear of your killing of Kings: Maſſacring of Peoples; Blowing up of Parliaments: and have a mind to be askt, Whether it be probable, that that ſhould be Gods cauſe, which needs to be maintained by ſuch Divelliſh means?

113 *Ad §.* 44, 45. In the two next Particles, which are all of this Chapter, that remain unſpoken to, you ſpend a great deal of reading, and wit, and reaſon, againſt ſome men, who pretending to honour and believe the Doctrin and practice of the viſible Church, (you mean, your own,) and condemning their Forefathers who forſook her, ſay, they would not have done ſo, yet remain divided from her Communion. Which men in my judgment cannot be defended. For if they believe the Doctrin of your Church, then muſt they believe this doctrin, that they are to return to your Communion. And therefore if they do not ſo, it cannot be avoided but they muſt be αὐτοκατάκριτοι, and ſo I leave them: only I am to remember you, that theſe men cannot pretend to be Proteſtants, becauſe they pretend to believe your Doctrin, which is oppoſite in Diameter unto the doctrin of Proteſtants; and therefore in a Work which you profeſs to have written meerly againſt Proteſtants, all this might have been ſpared.

CHAP. VI.

That Luther, *and the reſt of Proteſtants have added Hereſie unto Schiſm.*

BEcauſe Vice is beſt known by the contrary Vertue, we cannot well determine what *Hereſie* is, nor who be *Heretiques*, but by the oppoſite vertue of *Faith*, whoſe Nature being once underſtood as far as belongs to our preſent purpoſe we ſhall paſs on, with eaſe, to the definition of *hereſie*, and ſo be able to diſcern who be *Heretiques*. And this I intend to do, not by entring into ſuch particular Queſtions, as are controverted between Catholiques and Proteſtants, but only by applying ſome general grounds, either already proved, or elſe yielded to, on all ſides.

2 Almighty God having ordained Man to a ſupernatural End of Beatitude by *ſupernatural means*, it was requiſite that his underſtanding ſhould be enabled to apprehend that *End*, and *Means*, by a *ſupernatural* knowledge. And becauſe if ſuch a knowledge were no more than *probable*, it could not be able ſufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with human probabilities, being backed with the ſtrength of fleſh and blood; it was further neceſſary, that this ſupernatural knowledge ſhould be moſt *certain* and infallible; and that *Faith* ſhould believe nothing more *certainly* than that it ſelf is a moſt *certain* Belief, and ſo be able to beat down all gay *probabilities* of humane *Opinion*. And becauſe the aforeſaid *means* and *end of Beatifical Viſion*, do far exceed the reach of natural wit, the *certainty* of faith could not always be joyned with ſuch *evidence* of reaſon, as is wont to be found in the *Principles*, or *Concluſions*, of humane natural *Sciences*; that ſo all fleſh might not glory in the arm of fleſh, but he, *who glories, ſhould glory* (a) *in our Lord*. Moreover, it was expedient that our belief or aſſent to divine truths, ſhould not only be unknown, or *inevident* by any humane diſcourſe, but that abſolutely alſo it ſhould be obſcure in it ſelf,

(a) 2 Cor. 10.

and (ordinarily speaking) be void even of supernatural evidence, that so we might have occasion to actuate, and testifie the obedience which we ow to our God, not only by submitting our *will* to his *Will* and *Commands*, but by subjecting also our *understanding* to his *wisdom* and *words*, captivating (as the Apostle speaks) the same *understanding* (b) to the Obedience of Faith: Which occasion had been wanting, if Almighty God had made *clear* to us, the truths which now are *certainly*, but not *evidently*, presented to our minds. For where truth doth manifestly open it self, not *obedience* but *necessity* commands our assent. For this reason, Divines teach, that the Objects of faith, being not evident to humane reason, it is in mans power not only to abstain from believing, by suspending our Judgments, or exercising no act one way or other; but also to disbelieve, that is, to believe the contrary of that which faith proposeth; as the example of innumerable Arch-heretiques can bear witness. This obscurity of faith we learn from holy Scripture, according to those words of the Apostle: *Faith is the* (c) *substance of things to be hoped for, the argument of things not appearing.* And, *We see by a glass* (d) *in a dark manner, but then face to face.* And, accordingly, S. *Peter* saith: *Which you do well attending unto, as to* (e) *a Candle shining in a dark place.*

(b) 2 Cor. 10. 5.
(c) Heb. 11.
(d) 1 Cor. 13.
(e) 2 Pet. 1. 19.

3 Faith being then *obscure* (whereby it differeth from natural Sciences) and yet being most *certain* and *infallible* (wherein it surpasseth humane Opinion) it must relie upon some motive and ground, which may be able to give it *certainty*, and yet not release it from *Obscurity*. For if this *motive*, *ground*, or *formal Object* of Faith, were any thing evidently presented to our understanding: and if also we did evidently know, that it had a necessary connection with the Articles which we believe, our assent to such Articles could not be *obscure*, but *evident*; which, as we said, is against the nature of our faith. If likewise the motive and ground of our faith were *obscurely propounded* to *us*, but were not in it self *infallible*, it would leave our assent in *obscurity*, but could not endue it with *certainty*. We must therefore for the ground of our faith, find out a motive obscure to *us*, but most certain *in it self*, that the act of faith may remain both *obscure*, and *certain*. Such a *motive* as this, can be no other but the divine authority of Almighty God, revealing, or speaking those truths which our faith believes. For it is manifest, that God's infallible testimony may transfuse *Certainty* to our faith, and yet not draw it out of *obscurity*; because no humane discourse, or demonstration can evince, that God revealeth any supernatural truth, since God hath been no less perfect than he is, although he had never revealed any of those objects which we now believe.

4 Nevertheless, because Almighty God out of his infinite wisdom and sweetness doth concur with his Creatures in such sort as may befit the temper, and exigence of their natures; and because Man is a Creature endued with *reason*, God doth not exact of his Will or Understanding any other then, as the Apostle saith, *rationabile* (f) *obsequium*, an Obedience, sweetned with good reason; which could not so appear, if our Understanding were summoned to believe with *certainty*, things no way represented as infallible and *certain*. And therefore Almighty God obliging us under pain of eternal damnation to believe with greatest certainty divers verities, not known by the light of natural reason, cannot fail to furnish our Understanding, with such inducements, motives, and arguments as may sufficiently perswade any mind which is not partial or passionate, that the objects which we believe, proceed from an Authority so *Wise*, that it cannot be deceived, so *Good* that it cannot deceive; according to the words of *David*: *Thy Testimonies are made* (g) *credible exceedingly*. These inducements are by Divines, called *argumenta credibilitatis*, *arguments of credibility*, which though they cannot make us *evidently* see what we believe, yet they *evidently* convince that, in true wisdom, and prudence, the objects of faith deserve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. For without such reasons and inducements, our judgment of faith could not be conceived prudent, holy Scripture telling us, that, *he who soon* (h) *believes, is light of heart*. By these arguments and inducements our Understanding is both satisfied with *evidence of credibility*, and the objects of faith retain their *obscurity*: because it is a different thing to be evidently *credible*, and evidently *true*; as those who were present at the Miracles wrought by our blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, did not evidently see their doctrin to be true (for then it had not been *Faith* but *Science*, and all had been necessitated to believe, which we see fell out otherwise) but they were evidently convinced, that the things confirmed by such Miracles, were *most credible*, and worthy to be imbraced as truth revealed by God.

(f) Rom. 12. 1.
(g) Psal. 92.
(h) Eccles. 19. 4.

5 These evident arguments of Credibility are in great abundance found in the Visible Church of Christ, perpetually existing on earth. For, that there hath been a company of men professing such and such doctrines, we have from our next Predecessors, and these from theirs upward, till we come to the Apostles, and our Blessed Saviour; which gradation is known by evidence of sense, by reading books, or hearing what one man delivers to another. And it is evident that there was neither cause, nor possibility, that men so distant in place, so different in temper, so repugnant in private ends, did, or could agree to tell one and the self same thing, if it had been but a fiction invented by themselves: as ancient *Tertullian* well saith: *How is it likely that so many* (i) *and so great Churches should err in one faith? Among many events there is not one issue, the error of the Churches must needs have varied. But that which among many is found to be One, is not mistaken, but delivered. Dare then any body say, that they erred who delivered it?* With this never-interrupted existence of the Church are joyned the many and great miracles wrought by men of that Congregation or Church; the sanctity of the persons; the renowned victories over so many persecutions, both of all sorts of men, and of the infernal spirits; and lastly, the perpetual existence of so holy a Church, being brought up to the *Apostles* themselves. *She* comes to partake of the same assurance of truth, which *They* by so many powerful ways, did communicate to their Doctrin, & to the Church of their times, together with the divine Certainty which *they* received from our blessed Saviour himself, revealing to Mankind what he heard from his Father; and so we conclude with *Tertullian*: *We* receive it *from the Churches, the Churches* (k) *from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from his Father*: And if we once interrupt this line of succession, most certainly made known by means of holy *Tradition*, we cannot conjoyn the present Church, and doctrin, with the Church, and doctrin of the Apostles, but must invent some new means, and arguments sufficient of themselves to find out, and prove a

(i) *Præscript.* c. 28.
(k) *Præsc.* c. 21. & 37.

true

true Church, and faith independently of the *preaching*, and *writing* of the Apoſtles; neither of which can be known but by *Tradition*; as is truly obſerved by *Tertullian* ſaying: *I will preſcribe, that* (l) *there is no means to prove what the Apoſtles preached, but by the ſame Church which they founded.* (l) *Præſc. c.* 21.

6 Thus then we are to proceed: By evidence of manifeſt and incorrupt Tradition, I know that there hath always been a never-interrupted Succeſſion of men from the Apoſtles time, believing, profeſſing, and practiſing ſuch and ſuch doctrines: By evident arguments of credibility, as Miracles, Sanctity, Unity, *&c.* and, by all thoſe ways whereby the Apoſtles, and our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf confirmed their doctrin, we are aſſured that what the ſaid never-interrupted Church propoſeth, doth deſerve to be accepted and acknowledged as a divine truth: By evidence of Senſe, we ſee that the ſame Church propoſeth ſuch and ſuch doctrins as divine truths, that is, as revealed and teſtified by Almighty God. By this divine Teſtimony we are infallibly aſſured of what we believe: and ſo the laſt period, ground, motive, and *formal object* of our Faith, is, the infallible teſtimony of that ſupreme Verity, which neither can deceive, nor be deceived.

7 By this orderly deduction our Faith cometh to be endued with thoſe qualities which we ſaid were requiſite thereto; namely *Certainty*, *Obſcurity*, and *Prudence*. *Certainty* proceeds from the *infallible* Teſtimony of God propounded and conveyed to our underſtanding by ſuch a mean as is infallible in it ſelf, and to us is evidently known that it propoſeth this point or that, and which can manifeſtly declare in what ſenſe it propoſeth them; which means we have proved to be only the viſible Church of Chriſt. *Obſcurity*, from the manner in which God ſpeaks to Mankind, which ordinarily is ſuch, that it doth not manifeſtly ſhew the perſon who ſpeaks, nor the truth of the thing ſpoken. *Prudence* is not wanting, becauſe our faith is accompanied with ſo many arguments of *Credibility*, that every well-diſpoſed *Underſtanding*, may and ought to judge, that the doctrins ſo confirmed deſerve to be believed, as proceeding from divine Authority.

8 And thus from what hath been ſaid, we may eaſily gather the particular nature, or definition of *Faith*. For, *it is a voluntary, or free, infallible, obſcure aſſent to ſome truth, becauſe it is teſtified by God, and is ſufficiently propounded to us for ſuch*: which propoſal is ordinarily made by the Viſible Church of Chriſt. I ſay, *Sufficiently propoſed by the Church*; not that I purpoſe to diſpute whether the propoſal of the Church enter into the *formal Object*, or *Motive* of Faith: or whether any error be an hereſie, *formally and preciſely*, becauſe it is againſt the propoſition of the Church, as if ſuch propoſal were the formal Object of Faith, which D. *Potter*, to no purpoſe at all, labours ſo very hard to diſprove: But I only affirm, that when the Church propounds any Truth, as revealed by God, we are aſſured that it is ſuch indeed; and ſo it inſtantly grows, to be a fit object for Chriſtian faith, which inclines and enables us to believe whatſoever is duly preſented, as a thing revealed by Almighty God. And in the ſame manner we are ſure, that whoſoever oppoſeth any doctrin propoſed by the Church, doth thereby contradict a truth, which is teſtified by God: As when any lawful Superiour notifies his will, by the means, and, as it were, propoſal of ſome faithful meſſenger, the ſubject of ſuch a Superiour in performing, or neglecting what is delivered by the Meſſenger, is ſaid to obey, or diſobey his own lawful Superiour. And therefore becauſe the teſtimony of God is notified by the Church, we may, and we do moſt truly ſay, that not to believe what the Church propoſeth, is, to deny God's holy word or teſtimony ſignified to us by the Church, according to that ſaying of S. *Irenæus*, *he need not* go (m) *to any other to ſeek the truth, which we may eaſily receive from the Church.* (m) *Lib.* 3. *cont. Hæreſ. cap.* 4.

9 From this definition of faith we may alſo know what *Hereſie* is, by taking the contrary terms, as *Hereſie* is contrary to *Faith*, and ſaying: *Hereſie is a voluntary error againſt that which God hath revealed, and the Church hath propoſed for ſuch.* Neither doth it import, whether the error concern points in themſelves great or ſmall, fundamental or not fundamental. For more being required to an act of Vertue, than of Vice, if any truth though never ſo ſmall may be believed by *faith* as ſoon as we know it to be teſtified by divine revelation; much more will it be a formal *Hereſie* to deny any leaſt point ſufficiently propounded as a thing witneſſed by God.

10 This divine Faith is divided into *Actual*, and *Habitual*. *Actual* faith, or faith actuated, is when we are in act of conſideration, and belief of ſome myſterie of Faith; for example, that our Saviour Chriſt, is true God, and Man, *&c.* *Habitual* faith, is that from which we are denominated *Faithful*, or *Believers*, as by *Actual* faith they are ſtiled *Believing*. This *Habit* of faith is a *Quality* enabling us moſt firmly to believe Objects above humane diſcourſe, and it remaineth permanently in our Soul, even when we are ſleeping, or not thinking of any Myſterie of faith. This is the firſt among the three *Theological* Vertues. For *Charity* unites us to God, as he is infinitely *Good in himſelf*; *Hope* ties us to him, as he is unſpeakably *Good to us*. Faith joyns us to him, as he is the *Supreme immoveable Verity*. *Charity* relies on his *Goodneſs*; *Hope* on his *Power*; *Faith* on his divine *Wiſdom*. From hence it followeth, that *Faith* being one of the Vertues which Divines term *Infuſed* (that is, which cannot be acquired by humane wit, or induſtry, but are in their Nature and Eſſence ſupernatural,) it hath this property; that it is not deſtroyed by little and little, (contrarily to the *Habits*, called *acquiſiti*, that is, *gotten by humane endeavour*, which as they are ſucceſſively produced, ſo alſo are they loſt ſucceſſively, or by little and little) but it muſt either be conſerved entire, or wholly deſtroyed: And ſince it cannot ſtand entire with any one act which is directly contrary, it muſt be totally overthrown, and, as it were, demoliſhed, and razed by every ſuch act. Wherefore, as *Charity*, or the love of God, is expelled from our ſoul by any one act of *Hatred*, or any other mortal ſin againſt his Divine Majeſty: and as *Hope* is deſtroyed by any one act of voluntary *Deſperation*: ſo *Faith* muſt periſh by any one act of *Hereſie*, becauſe every ſuch act is directly, and formally oppoſite thereunto. I know that ſome ſins which (as Divines ſpeak) are *ex genere ſuo*, in their kind, grievous and *mortal*, may be much leſſened, and fall to be *venial*, *ob levitatem materiæ*, becauſe they may happen to be exerciſed in a matter of ſmall conſideration; as for example, to ſteal a penny is venial, although Theft in his kind be a deadly ſin. But it is likewiſe true, that this Rule is not general for all ſorts of ſins; there being ſome ſo inexcuſably wicked of their own nature, that no ſmalneſs of matter, nor paucity in number

can defend them from being deadly ſins. For, to give an inſtance, what blaſphemy againſt God, or voluntary falſe Oath is not a deadly ſin? Certainly none at all, although the ſalvation of the whole world ſhould depend upon ſwearing ſuch a falſhood. The like happeth in our preſent caſe of Hereſie, the iniquity redounding to the injury of God's ſupreme wiſdom and goodneſs, is always great, and enormous. They were no precious ſtones which *David* (n) pickt out of the water, to encounter *Golias*, & yet if a man take from the number but one, and ſay they were but four, againſt the Scripture affirming them to have been five, he is inſtantly guilty of a damnable ſin. Why? Becauſe by this ſubſtraction of *One*, he doth deprive God's Word and Teſtimony of *all* credit and infallibility. For, if either he could deceive, or be deceived in any *one* thing, it were but wiſdom to ſuſpect him in *all*. And ſeeing every *Hereſie* oppoſeth ſome Truth revealed by God: it is no wonder that no one can be excuſed from deadly, and damnable ſin; for, if voluntary *Blaſphemy*, and *Perjury*, which are oppoſed only to the *infuſed Moral* Vertue of *Religion*, can never be excuſed from mortal ſin: much leſs can *Hereſie* be excuſed, which oppoſeth the *Theological* Vertue of *Faith*.

(n) 1. *Reg.* 17.

11 If any object, that *Schiſm* may ſeem to be a greater ſin than *Hereſie*: becauſe the Vertue of *Charity* (to which Schiſm is oppoſite) is greater than Faith, according to the Apoſtle, ſaying: *Now there remain* (o) *Faith, Hope, Charity; but the greater of theſe is Charity.* S. *Thomas* anſwers in theſe words: *Charity hath two Objects, one principal, to wit, the Divine* (p) *Goodneſs; and another ſecondary, namely the good of our Neighbour; But Schiſm and other ſins which are committed againſt our Neighbour, are oppoſite to Charity in reſpect of this ſecondary good, which is leſs than the object of Faith, which is God, as he is the Prime Verity, on which Faith doth relie; and therefore theſe ſins are leſs than Infidelity.* He takes *Infidelity* after a general manner, as it comprehends *Hereſie*, and other vices againſt Faith.

(o) 1 *Cor.* 13. 13.

(p) 2. 2. *q.* 39. *ar.* 2. *in corp & ad* 3.

12 Having therefore ſufficiently declared, wherein *Hereſie* conſiſts; Let us come to prove that which we propoſed in this Chapter. Where I deſire, it be ſtill remembred: That the viſible Catholique Church cannot err damnably, as D. *Potter* confeſſeth. And, that when *Luther* appeared, there was no other viſible true Church of Chriſt diſagreeing from the *Roman*, as we have demonſtrated in the next precedent Chapter.

13 Now, that *Luther* and his followers cannot be excuſed from formal *Hereſie*, I prove by theſe reaſons. To oppoſe any truth propounded by the viſible true Church as revealed by God, is formal *Hereſie*, as we have ſhewed out of the definition of *Hereſie*: But *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the reſt did oppoſe divers truths propounded by the viſible Church as revealed by God; yea they did therefore oppoſe her, becauſe ſhe propounded, as divine revealed truths, things which they judged either to be falſe, or humane inventions: Therefore they committed formal *Hereſie*.

14 Moreover, every Errour againſt any doctrin revealed by God, is a damnable Hereſie, whether the matter in it ſelf be great or ſmall, as I proved before: and therefore either the Proteſtants or the *Roman* Church muſt be guilty of formal Hereſie, becauſe one of them muſt err againſt the word and teſtimony of God: but you grant (perforce) that the *Roman* Church doth not err damnably, and I add that ſhe cannot err damnably becauſe ſhe is the truly Catholique Church, which, you confeſs, cannot err damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt be guilty of formal *Hereſie*.

15 Beſides, we have ſhewed that the viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies, and therefore muſt be infallible in all her Propoſals; which being once ſuppoſed, it manifeſtly followeth, that to oppoſe what ſhe delivereth as revealed by God, is not ſo much to oppoſe *her*, as *God* himſelf; and therefore cannot be excuſed from grievous Hereſie.

16 Again, if *Luther* were an *Heretique*, for thoſe points wherein he diſagreed from the *Roman* Church, All they who agree with him in thoſe very points, muſt likewiſe be Heretiques. Now, that *Luther* was a formal Heretique I demonſtrate in this manner. To ſay, that God's viſible true Church is not univerſal, but confined to one only place or corner of the world, is according to your own expreſs words (q) *properly* Hereſie, *againſt that Article of the Creed, wherein we profeſs to believe the holy Catholique Church*: And you brand *Donatus* with hereſie, becauſe he limited the univerſal Church to *Africa*. But it is manifeſt, and acknowledged by *Luther* himſelf, and other chief Proteſtants that *Luther*'s Reformation when it firſt began (and much more for divers ages before) was not *univerſal*, nor ſpread over the world, but was confined to that compaſs of ground which did contain *Luther*'s body. Therefore his Reformation cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie. If S. *Auguſtine* in thoſe times ſaid to the Donatiſts, *Theſe are innumerable teſtimonies* (r) *of holy Scripture in which it appeareth that the Church of Chriſt is not only in Africa, as theſe men with moſt impudent vanity do rave, but that ſhe is ſpread over the whole earth*: much more may it be ſaid; It appeareth by innumerable teſtimonies of holy Scripture that the Church of Chriſt cannot be confined to the City of *Wittemberg*, or to the place where *Luther*'s feet ſtood, but muſt be ſpread over the whole world. It is therefore *moſt impudent vanity, and dotage* to limit her to *Luther's* Reformation. In another place alſo this holy Father writes no leſs effectually againſt *Luther* than againſt the *Donatiſts*. For having out of thoſe words, *In thy ſeed all Nations ſhall be bleſſed*, proved that God's Church muſt be *univerſal*, he ſaith: *Why* (ſ) *do you ſuperadd, by ſaying that Chriſt remains heir in no part of the earth, except where he may have* Donatus *for his Coheir. Give me this* (Univerſal) *Church if it be among you: ſhew your ſelves to all Nations, which we already ſhew to be bleſſed in this Seed: Give us this* (Church) *or elſe laying aſide all fury, receive her from us.* But it is evident, that *Luther* could not, When he ſaid, *At the beginning I was alone*, give us an *univerſal* Church: Therefore happy had he been, if he had then, and his followers would now, *receive her from us.* And therefore we muſt conclude with the ſame holy Father, laying in another place of the univerſal Church: *She hath this* (t) *moſt certain mark, that ſhe cannot be hidden: She is then known to all Nations. The Sect of* Donatus *is unknown to many Nations; therefore that cannot be ſhe. The Sect of* Luther (at leaſt when he began, and much more before his beginning) *was unknown to many Nations, therefore that cannot be ſhe.*

(q) *Pag.* 826.

(r) *Epiſt.* 50.

(ſ) *De Unit. Eccleſ. cap.* 6.

(t) *Cont. lit. Petil. lib.* 1. *cap.* 304.

17 And that it may yet further appear how perfectly *Luther* agreed with the *Donatiſts*: It is to be noted, that they never taught, that the Catholique Church ought not to extend it ſelf further than

that

that part of *Africa*, where their faction raigned, but only that in fact it was so confined, because all the rest of the Church was prophaned, by communicating with *Cæcilianus*, whom they falsly affirmed to have been ordained Bishop by those who were *Traditors*, or givers up of the Bible to the Persecutors to be burned: yea at that very time they had some of their Sect residing in *Rome*, and sent thither one *Victor*, a Bishop, under colour to take care of the Brethren in that City, but indeed, as *Baronius* (u) observeth, that the world might account them Catholiques by communicating with the Bishop of *Rome*, to communicate with whom was ever taken by the Ancient Fathers as an assured sign of being a true Catholique. They had also, as S. *Augustin* witnesseth, a pretended (w) Church in the house and territory of a Spanish Lady called *Lucilla*, who went flying out of the Catholique Church, because she had been justly checked by *Cæcilianus*. And the same *Saint* speaking of the conference he had with *Fortunius* the Donatist, saith: *Here did he first* (x) *attempt to affirm that his Communion was spread over the whole Earth*, &c. *but because the thing was evidently false, they got out of this discourse by confusion of language* whereby nevertheless they sufficiently declared, that they did not hold that the true Church ought necessarily to be confined to one place, but only by meer necessity were forced to yield that it was so in fact, because their Sect which they held to be the only true Church was not spread over the world: In which point *Fortunius*, and the rest were more modest, than he who should affirm that *Luther*'s reformation in the very beginning was *spread over the whole Earth*; being at that time by many degrees not so far diffused as the Sect of the *Donatists*. I have no desire to prosecute the similitude of Protestants with *Donatists*, by remembring that the Sect of these men was begun and promoted by the passion of *Lucilla*; and, Who is ignorant what influence two women, the Mother, and Daughter, ministred to Protestancy in *England*? Nor will I stand to observe their very likeness of phrase with the *Donatists*, who called the Chair of *Rome*, the Chair of pestilence, and the *Roman* Church an Harlot, which is D. *Potter*'s own phrase, wherein he is less excusable than they, because he maintaineth her to be a true Church of Christ: and therefore let him duly ponder these words of S. *Augustin* against the *Donatists*, *If I persecute him justly who detracts* (y) *from his Neighbour, why should I not persecute him who detracts from the Church of Christ, and saith, This is not she, but this is an Harlot?* And least of all, will I consider, whether you may not be well compared to one *Ticonius* a *Donatist*, who wrote against *Parmenianus* likewise a *Donatist*, who blasphemed, that the Church of Christ had perished (as you do even in this your Book write against some of your Protestant Brethren, or as you call them Zelots among you, who hold the very same or rather a worse Heresie) and yet remained among them, even after *Parmenianus* had excommunicated him (as those your Zealous Brethren would proceed against you if it were in their power,) and yet, like *Ticonius*, you remain in their Communion, and come not into that Church which is, hath been, and shall ever be universal: For which very cause S. *Augustin* complains of *Ticonius*, that although he wrote against the Donatists, yet he was of *an heart* (z) *so extremely absurd*, as not to forsake them altogether. And speaking of the same thing in another place he observes, that although *Ticonius* did manifestly confute them who affirmed that the Church had perished; yet *he saw not* (saith this holy Father) *that which in good consequence* (a) *he should have seen, that those Christians of Africa belonged to the Church spread over the whole world, who remained united, not with them who were divided from the communion and unity of the same world, but with such as did communicate with the whole world.* But *Parmenianus, and the rest of the Donatists saw that consequence, and resolved rather to settle their mind in obstinacy against the most manifest truth which* Ticonius *maintained, than by yielding thereto, to be overcome by those Churches in Africa, which enjoyed the Communion of that unity which* Ticonius *defended, from which they had divided themselves.* How fitly these words agree to Catholiques in *England* in respect of the Protestants, I desire the Reader to consider. But these and the like resemblances of Protestants to the *Donatists*, I willingly let pass, and only urge the main point: That since *Luther*'s Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before *Luther*, and yet was (because so forsooth they will needs have it) in the Apostles time, they must of necessity affirm heretically with the *Donatists*, that the true and unspotted Church of Christ perished; and that she which remained on earth was (O blasphemy!) an Harlot. Moreover the same heresie follows out of the doctrin of D. *Potter*, and other Protestants, that the Church may err in points not fundamental, because we have shewed that every errour against any one revealed truth, is *Heresie*, and *damnable*, whether the matter be otherwise, of it self, great or small. And how can the Church more truly be said to perish, than when she is permitted to maintain a *damnable Heresie*? Besides, we will hereafter prove, that by any act of Heresie, all divine faith is lost; and to imagine a true Church of faithful persons without any faith, is as much as to fancy a living man without life. It is therefore clear, that Donatist-like they hold that the Church of Christ perished: yea they are worse than the *Donatists*, who said, that the Church remained at least in *Africa*; whereas Protestants must of necessity be forced to grant, that for a long space before *Luther*, she was no where at all. But let us go forward to other reasons.

(u) *Anno* 321. *nu.* 2. *Spond.*

(w) *De uni. Eccles. c.* 3.

(x) *Ep.* 163.

(y) *Conc. super gest. cum Emerit.*

(z) *De doctr. christ. lib.* 3. *cap.* 30.

(a) *Cont. Parm. l.* 1. *cap.* 1.

18 The holy Scripture, and Ancient Fathers do assign Separation from the Visible Church as a mark of *Heresie*; according to that of S. *John*: *They went out* (b) *from us.* And, *Some who* (c) *went out from us.* And, *Out of you shall* (d) *arise men speaking perverse things.* And accordingly *Vincentius Lyrinensis* saith: *Who ever* (e) *began heresies, who did not first separate himself from the universality, Antiquity, and Consent of the Catholique Church?* But it is manifest, that when *Luther* appeared, there was no visible Church distinct from the *Roman*, out of which she could depart, as it is likewise wel known that *Luther*, and his followers departed out of *her*: Therefore she is no way liable to this Mark of *Heresie*, but Protestants cannot possibly avoid it. To this purpose S. *Prosper* hath these pithy words: A Christian communicating (f) with the universal Church *is a Catholique, and he who is divided from her, is an Heretique, and Antichrist.* But *Luther* in his first Reformation could not communicate with the visible Catholique Church of those times, because he began his Reformation by opposing the supposed Errors of the then visible Church: we must therefore say with S. *Prosper*, that he was an *Heretique*, &c. Which likewise is no less clearly proved out of S. *Cyprian*, saying: *Not we* (g) *departed from them, but they from us, and since Heresies and Schisms are bred afterwards, whilst they make to themselves divers Conventicles, they have forsaken the head and origin of Truth.*

(b) 2. *Joan.* 19.

(c) *Act.* 15. 24.

(d) Act. 20. 30

(e) *Lib. adversus hær. c.* 34.

(f) *Divid. temp. cap.* 5.

(g) *Ep.* 57. *ad Damas.*

19. And that we might not remain doubtful what Separation it is, which is the mark of *Hereſie*, the Ancient Fathers tell us more in particular, that it is from the Church of *Rome*, as it is the Sea of *Peter*. And therefore D. *Potter* need not to be ſo hot with us, becauſe we ſay, and write, that the Church of *Rome*, in that ſenſe as ſhe is the Mother-Church of all others, and with which all the reſt agree, is truly called the *Catholique Church*. S. *Hierome* writing to Pope *Damaſus*, ſaith: *I am in the Communion* (h) *of the Chair of Peter; I know that the Church is built upon that Rock. Whoſoever ſhall eat the Lamb out of this houſe, he is prophane. If any ſhall not be in the Ark of Noe, he ſhall periſh in the time of the deluge. Whoſoever doth not gather with thee, doth ſcatter, that is, he that is not of Chriſt is of Antichriſt.* And elſewhere, *Woich doth he* (i) *call his faith? That of the* Roman *Church? Or that which is contained in the Books of* Origen.? *If he anſwer, The Roman; then we are Catholiques, who have tranſlated nothing of the error of* Origen. And yet farther: *Know thou, that the* (k) Roman *faith commended by the voyce of the Apoſtle doth not receive theſe deluſions, though an Angel ſhould denounce otherwiſe than it hath once been preached.* S. *Ambroſe* recounting how his Brother *Satyrus* inquiring for a Church wherein to give thanks for his delivery from ſhipwrack, ſaith, *He called unto him* (l) *the Biſhop, neither did he eſteem any favour to be true, except that of the true faith, and he asked of him whether he agreed with the Catholique Biſhops; that is, with the* Roman *Church?* And having underſtood that he was a *Schiſmatique*, that is, ſeparated from the *Roman* Church, he abſtained from communicating with him. Where we ſee the priviledge of the *Roman* Church confirmed both by word and deed, by doctrin and practice. And the ſame *Saint* ſaith of the *Roman Church*: *From thence the Rites* (m) *of Venerable Communion do flow to all. Saint Cyprian* ſaith: *They are bold* (n) *to ſail to the Chair of* Peter, *and to the principal Church, from whence Prieſtly unity hath ſprung. Neither do they conſider, that they are* Romans, *whoſe faith was commended by the preaching of the Apoſtle, to whom falſhood cannot have acceſs.* Where we ſee this holy Father joyns together the *principal Church*, and the *Chair of Peter*; and affirm th that *falſhood* not only hath not had, but *cannot have acceſs to that Sea.* And elſewhere: *Thou wrot'ſt that I ſhould ſend* (o) *a Copy of the ſame letters to Cornelius our Colleague, that, laying aſide all ſollicitude, he might now be aſſured that thou didſt communicate with him, that is, with the Catholique Church.* What think you *M. Doctor* of theſe words? Is it ſo ſtrange a thing to take for one and the ſame thing, to communicate with the *Church and Pope of* Rome, and to communicate with the *Catholique Church?* S. *Irenæus* ſaith: *Becauſe it were long to number the ſucceſſion of all Churches,* (p) *we declaring the Tradition* (and ſaith preached to men, and coming to us by Traditions;) *of the moſt great, moſt ancient, and moſt known Church, founded by the two moſt glorious Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul, *which Tradition it hath from the Apoſtles, coming to us by ſucceſſion of Biſhops; we confound all thoſe who any way either by evil complacence of themſelves, or vain glory, or by blindneſs, or ill opinion, do gather otherwiſe than they ought. For to this Church for a more powerful Principality, it is neceſſary that all Churches reſort, that is, all faithful people of what place ſoever: in which* (Roman *Church*) *the Tradition which is from the Apoſtles hath always been conſerved from thoſe who are every where.* Saint *Auguſtine* ſaith: *It grieves us* (q) *to ſee you ſo to lie cut off. Number the Prieſts even from the Sea of* Peter; *and conſider in that order of Fathers who ſucceeded to whom. She is the Rock which the proud Gates of Hell do not overcome.* And in another place, ſpeaking of *Cæcilianus*, he ſaith: *He might contemn the conſpiring* (r) *multitude of his Enemies, becauſe he knew himſelf to be united, by Communicatory letters both to the* Roman *Church in which the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolique did always flouriſh; and to other Countries from whence the Goſpel came firſt into* Africa. Ancient *Tertullian* ſaith: *If thou be neer* Italy, *thou haſt* Rome, *whoſe* (s) *Authority is neer at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the Apoſtles have poured all Doctrine, together with their bloud.* Saint *Baſil* in a letter to the Biſhop of *Rome* ſaith, *In very deed that which was given* (t) *by our Lord to thy Piety, is worthy of that moſt excellent voyce which proclaimed thee Bleſſed, to wit, that thou mayſt diſcern betwixt that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawful and pure, and without any diminution mayeſt preach the faith of our Anceſtours.* *Maximinianus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* about twelve hundred years ago, ſaid: *All the bounds of the earth who have ſincerely acknowledged our Lord, and Catholiques through the whole world profeſſing the true faith, look upon the power of the Biſhop of* Rome, *as upon the Sun,* &c. *For the Creator of the world, amongſt all men of the world elected him,* (he ſpeaks of *S. Peter*) *to whom he granted the Chair of Doctour to be principally poſſeſſed by a perpetual right of Priviledge; that whoſoever is deſirous to know any Divine and profound thing, may have recourſe to the Oracle, and Doctrin of this Inſtruction.* *John* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, more than eleven hundred years ago in an Epiſtle to Pope *Hormiſda*, writeth thus: *Becauſe* (u) *the beginning of ſalvation is to conſerve the rule of right Faith, and in no wiſe to ſwarve from the Tradition of our Fore Fathers; becauſe the words of our Lord cannot fail, ſaying: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church; the proofs of deeds have made good thoſe words, becauſe in the Sea Apoſtolical the Catholique Religion is always conſerved inviolable.* And again: *We promiſe hereafter not to recite in the ſacred Myſteries the names of them who are excluded from the Communion of the Catholique Church, that is to ſay, who conſent not fully with the Sea Apoſtolique.* Many other Authorities of the Ancient Fathers might be produced to this purpoſe; but theſe may ſerve to ſhew; that both the *Latin*, and *Greek* Fathers held for a Note of being a Catholique, or an Heretique, To have been united, or divided from the Sea of *Rome*. And I have purpoſely alleadged only ſuch Authorities of Fathers, as ſpeak of the priviledges of the Sea of *Rome*, as of things permanent, and depending on our *Saviour*'s promiſe to S. *Peter*, from which a general rule, and ground ought to be taken for all Ages, becauſe *Heaven and Earth ſhall* (w) *paſs, but the word of our Lord ſhall remain for ever.* So that I here conclude, that ſeeing it is manifeſt that *Luther* and his followers divided themſelves from the Sea of *Rome*, they bear the inſeparable Mark of *Hereſie*.

(h) *Lib. 1. Apolog.*

(i) *Ibid. lib. 3.*

(k)

(l) *De obitu Satyri fratris.*

(m) *Lib. 1. ep. 4. ad Imperatores.*

(n) *Epiſt. 55. ad Cornel.*

(o) *Epiſt 52.*

(p) *Lib. 3 cont. hær. c. 3.*

(q) *In Pſal. cont. partem Donati.*

(r) *Ep. 162.*

(s) *Præſcr. cap. 36.*

(t) *Epiſt. ad Pont. Rom.*

(u) *Epiſt. ad Hormiſ. P. P.*

(w) Mat. 24. 35.

20. And though my meaning be not to treat the point of Ordination, or Succeſſion, in the Proteſtants Church, becauſe the Fathers alleadged in the laſt reaſon, aſſign Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church; I muſt not omit to ſay, that according to the grounds of *Proteſtants* themſelves, they can neither pretend *perſonal Succeſſion* of Biſhops, nor *Succeſſion of Doctrin*. For whereas Succeſſion of

Biſhops

Bishops signifies a never-interrupted line of Persons, endued with an indelible *Quality*, which Divines call a *Character*, which cannot be taken away by *deposition, degradation*, or other means whatsoever; and endued also with Jurisdiction and Authority to teach, to preach, to govern the Church by laws, precepts, censures, *&c.* Protestants cannot pretend Succession in either of these. For (besides that there was never Protestant Bishop before *Luther*, and that there can be no continuance of *Succession*, where there was no beginning to succeed,) they commonly acknowledge no *Character*, and consequently must affirm that when their pretended Bishops, or Priests are deprived of Jurisdiction, or degraded, they remain meer lay persons as before their Ordination; fulfilling what *Tertullian* objects as a mark of Heresie: *To day a Priest, to morrow* (x) *a Lay-man*. For if here be no immoveable *Character*, their power of *Order* must consist only in Jurisdiction, and authority, or in a kind of moral deputation to some function, which therefore may be taken away by the same power, by which it was given. Neither can they pretend Succession in Authority, or Jurisdiction. For all the Authority, or Jurisdiction, which they had, was conferred by the Church of *Rome*, that is, by the Pope: Because the whole Church collectively doth not meet to ordain Bishops or Priests, or to give them Authority. But, according to their own doctrin, they believe that the Pope neither *hath, or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence, or Authority Ecclesiastical, or Spiritual within this Realm*, which they swear even when they are ordained Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: How then can the Pope give Jurisdiction where they swear he neither *hath, or OUGHT to have, any*? Or, if yet he had, how could they without *Schism* withdraw themselves from his obedience? Besides, the *Roman* Church never gave them Authority to oppose Her, by whom it was given. But grant, their first Bishops had such Authority from the Church of *Rome*: after the decease of those men, Who gave Authority to their pretended Successours? The Primate of *England*? But from whom had he such Authority? And after his decease, who shall conferr Authority upon his Successors? The Temporal Magistrate? King *Henry*, neither a Catholique, nor a Protestant? King *Edward*, a Child? Queen *Elizabeth* a Woman? An Infant of one hours Age, is true King in case of his Predecessor's decease: But shall your Church lie fallow till that Infant-King and green Head of the Church come to years of discretion? Do your Bishops, your Hierarchy, your Succession, your Sacraments, your being, or not being, Heretiques, for want of Succession, depend on this new-found Supremacy-doctrin brought in by such a man meerly upon base occasions, and for shameful ends; impugned by *Calvin*, and his followers; derided by the Christian world; and even by chief Protestants, as D. *Andrews*, *Wotton*, &c. not held for any necessary point of Faith? And from whom I pray you, had Bishops their Authority when there were no Christian Kings? Must the *Greek* Patriarchs receive spiritual Jurisdiction from the *Great Turk*? Did the Pope by the Baptism of Princes, lose the spiritual Power he formerly had of conferring spiritual Jurisdiction upon Bishops? Hath the Temporal Magistrate authority to preach, to assoil from sins, to inflict Excommunications, and other Censures? Why hath he not power to excommunicate, as well as to dispense in Irregularity, as our late Soveraign Lord King *James*, either dispensed with the late *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*, or else gave commission to some Bishops to do it? And since they were subject to their Primate, and not he to them, it is clear, that they had no power to dispense with him, but that power must proceed from the Prince, as Superiour to them all, and head of the Protestants Church in *England*. If he have no such authority, how can he give to others what himself hath not? Your Ordination, or Consecration of Bishops and Priests imprinting no *Character*, can only consist in giving a Power, Authority, Jurisdiction, or (as I said before) some kind of Depuration to exercise Episcopal, or Priestly functions: If then, the Temporal Magistrate conferrs this power, *&c.* he can, nay he cannot chuse but, Ordain and Consecrate Bishops, and Priests, as often as he conferrs Authority or Jurisdiction: and your Bishops assoon as they are designed and confirmed by the King, must *ipso facto* be Ordained and Consecrated by him without intervention of *Bishops*, or *Matter* and *Form* of *Ordination*: Which absurdities you will be more unwilling to grant, than well able to avoid, if you will be true to your own doctrins. The Pope from whom originally you must beg your Succession of Bishops, never received, nor will, nor can acknowledge to receive any Spiritual Jurisdiction from any Temporal Prince, and therefore if Jurisdiction must be derived from Princes, he hath none at all: and yet either you must acknowledge, that he hath true Spiritual Jurisdiction, or that your selves can receive none from him.

(x) *Præscr. cap.* 41.

21. Moreover, this new Reformation, or Reformed Church of Protestants, will by them be pretended to be *Catholique* or *Universal*, and not confined to *England* alone, as the Sect of the *Donatists* was to *Africa*: and therefore it must comprehend all the Reformed Churches in *Germany*, *Holland*, *Scotland*, *France*, *&c.* In which number, they of *Germany*, *Holland*, and *France* are not governed by Bishops, nor regard any personal succession, unless of such fat-beneficed Bishops as *Nicholas Amsfordius*, who was consecrated by *Luther*, (though *Luther* himself was never Bishop) as witnesseth (y) *Dresserus*. And though *Scotland* hath of late admitted some Bishops, I much doubt whether they hold them to be necessary, or of divine Institution; and so their enforced admitting of them, doth not so much furnish that Kingdom with *personal succession* of Bishops, as it doth convince them to want *succession of doctrin*; since in this their neglect of Bishops, they disagree both from the milder Protestants of *England*, and the true Catholique Church: And by this want of a continued personal Succession of Bishops, they retain the note of *Schism*, and *Heresie*. So that the Church of Protestants must either not be *universal*, as being confined to *England*; Or if you will needs comprehend all those Churches which want succession, you must confess, that your Church doth not only communicate with *Schismatical* and *Heretical* Churches, but is also compounded of such Churches, and your selves cannot avoid the note of Schismatiques, or Heretiques, if it were but for participating with such heretical Churches. For it is impossible to retain Communion with the true Catholique Church, and yet agree with them who are divided from her by Schism, or Heresie; because that were to affirm, that for the self same time, they could be *within* and *without* the Catholique Church, as proportionably I discoursed in the next

(y) *In Millenario sexto Pag.* 187.

precedent

precedent Chapter, concerning the communicating of moderate Protestants with those who maintain that Heresie of the Latency and Invisibility of Gods Church, where I brought a place of S. *Cyprian* to this purpose, which the Reader may be pleased to review in the *fifth Chapter*, and 17 *Number*.

22 But besides this defect in the personal Succession of Protestant Bishops, there is another of great moment, which is, that they want the right *Form* of ordaining *Bishops*, and *Priests*, because the manner which they use is so much different from that of the *Roman* Church (at least according to the common opinion of Divines) that it cannot be sufficient for the *Essence* of *Ordination*; as I could demonstrate if this were the proper place of such a Treatise, and will not fail to do if D. *Potter* give me occasion. In the mean time the Reader may be pleased to read the Author (z) cited here in the margent, and then compare the form of our Ordination with that of Protestants; and to remember that if the form which they use either in consecrating Bishops, or in ordaining Priests be at *least* doubtful, they can neither have *undoubted* Priests, nor Bishops. For *Priests* cannot be ordained but by true *Bishops*, nor can any be a true Bishop, unless he first be *Priest*. I say, their Ordination is at *least* doubtful; because that sufficeth for my present purpose. For Bishops and Priests, whose Ordination is *notoriously known* to be but doubtful, are not to be esteemed Bishops, or Priests: and no man without Sacriledge can receive Sacraments from them; all which they administer unlawfully: And (if we except Baptism, with manifest danger of invalidity, and with obligation to be at least conditionally repeated) so Protestants must remain doubtful of Remission of sins, of their Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and may not pretend to be a true Church; which cannot subsist without *undoubted* true Bishops and Priests, nor without due administration of Sacraments, which (according to Protestants) is an essential note of the true Church. And it is a world to observe the proceeding of English Protestants in this point of their *Ordinations*. For first, *An.* 3. *Edw.* 6. *cap.* 2. when he was a Child about 12. years of age, *It was enacted, that such* (a) *form of making, and consecrating of Bishops and Priests, as by six Prelates, and six other to be appointed by the King, should be devised* (mark this word *devised*) *and set forth under the great Seal; should be used, and none other.* But after this Act was repealed 1. *Mar. Sess.* 2. in so much as that when afterward *An.* 6. & 7. *Reg. Eliz.* Bishop *Bonner* being endicted upon a certificate made by D. *Horn* a Protestant Bishop of *Winchester*, for his refusal of the Oath of Supremacy; and he excepting against the indictment because D. *Horn* was no Bishop; all the Judges resolved that his exception was good, if indeed D. *Horn* was not Bishop, and they were all at a stand, till *An.* 8. *Eliz. cap.* 1. the Act of *Edw.* 6. was renewed and confirmed, with a particular *proviso*, that no man should be impeached or molested by means of any certificate by any Bishop or Archbishop made before this last Act. Whereby it is clear, that they made some doubt of their own ordination, and that there is nothing but uncertainty in the whole business of their Ordination, which (forsooth) must depend upon Six Prelates, the great Seal, Acts of Parliament being contrary one to another, and the like.

(z) See *Adam. Tannerum tom.* 4. *disp.* 7. *quæst.* 2. *dub.* 3 & 4.

(a) *Dyer. fol.* 234. *term. Mich.* 6, & 7. *Eliz.*

23 But though they want Personal Succession, yet at least they have succession of Doctrin as they say, and pretend to prove, because they believe as the *Apostles* believed. This is to beg the Question, and to take what they may be sure, will never be granted. For if they want Personal Succession, and slight Ecclesiastical Tradition, how will they perswade any man, that they agree with the doctrin of the Apostles? We have heard *Tertullian* saying: *I will prescribe* (b) (against all Heretiques) *that there is no means to prove what the Apostles preached, but by the same Churches which they founded.* And S. *Irenæus* tells us that, *We may* (c) *behold the Tradition of the Apostles in every Church, if men be desirous to hear the truth, and we can number them who were made Bishops by the Apostles in Churches, and their Successors even to us.* And the same Father in another place saith: *We ought to obey* (d) *those Priests who are in the Church, who have Succession from the Apostles; and who together with Succession in their Bishopricks have received the certain gift of truth.* S. *Augustine* saith: *I am kept in the Church* (e) *by the succession of Priests from the very Sea of* Peter *the Apostle, to whom our Saviour after his Resurrection committed his sheep to be fed, even to the present Bishop.* *Origen* to this purpose giveth us a good and wholsome Rule (happy, if himself had followed the same) in these excellent words: *Since there be many who think* (f) *they believe the things which are of Christ, and some are of different opinion from those who went before them; let the preaching of the Church be kept, which is delivered by the Apostles by order of Succession, and remains in the Church to this very day; that only is to be believed for truth, which in nothing disagrees from the Tradition of the Church.* In vain then do these men brag of the doctrin of the Apostles, unless first they can demonstrate that they enjoyed a continued succession of Bishops from the Apostles, and can shew us a Church which, according to S. *Austin*, is deduced *by undoubted* SUCCESSION *from the Sea* (g) *of the Apostles, even to the present Bishops.*

(b) *Sup. c.* 5.

(c) *L.* 3. *c.* 5.

(d) *L.* 4. *c.* 43.

(e) *Contr. epist. Fundam. c.* 4.

(f) *Præf. ad lib. Periarchon.*

(g) *Cont. Faust. cap.* 2.

24 But yet nevertheless, suppose it were granted, that they agreed with the doctrin of the Apostles this were not sufficient to prove a *Succession* in *Doctrine*. For *Succession*, besides agreement or similitude, doth also require a never-interrupted conveying of such doctrine, from the time of the Apostles, till the dayes of those persons, who challenge such a *Succession*. And so S. *Augustine* saith: we are to believe that Gospel which from the time of the Apostles, *the* (h) *Church* hath brought down to our days *by a never-interrupted course of times and by undoubted succession of connection.* Now, that the Reformation, begun by *Luther*, was interrupted for divers ages before him, is manifest out of History, and by his endeavouring a Reformation, which must presuppose Abuses. He cannot therefore pretend a continued Succession of that Doctrin which he sought to revive, and reduce to the knowledge, and practise of men. And they ought not to prove that they have a Succession of doctrin, because they agreee with the doctrin of the Apostles; but contrarily we must infer, that they agree not with the Apostles, because they cannot pretend a never-interrupted succession of doctrin from the times of the Apostles, till *Luther*. And here it is not amiss to note, that although the *Waldenses*, *Wickliff*, &c. had agreed with Protestants in all points of doctrin; yet they could not brag of Succession from them, because their doctrin hath not been free from *interruption*, which necessarily crosseth *Succession*.

(h) *Lib.* 28. *cont. Faust. cap.* 2.

25. And

25 And as want of Succeſſion of Perſons and *Doctrin*, cannot ſtand with that *Univerſality of Time*, which is inſeparable from the *Catholique* Church; ſo likewiſe the diſagreeing Sects which are diſperſed throughout divers Countries, and Nations, cannot help towards that *Univerſality* of *Place*, wherewith the true Church muſt be endued: but rather ſuch local multiplication, doth more and more lay open their diviſion, and want of ſucceſſion in Doctrin. For the excellent Obſervation of S. *Auguſtine* doth punctually agree with all modern Heretiques; wherein this holy Father having cited theſe words out of the Prophet *Ezechiel*, (i) *My flocks are diſperſed upon the whole face of the Earth*; he adds this remarkable ſentence: *Not all Heretiques* (k) *are ſpread over the face of the Earth, and yet there are Heretiques ſpread over the whole face of the Earth, ſome here, ſome there, yet they are wanting in no place: they know not one another. One Sect for example in Africa, another Hereſie in the Eaſt, another in Egypt, another in Meſopotamia. In divers places there are divers: one Mother-pride hath begot them all; as our own Mother the Catholique Church hath brought forth all faithful people diſperſed throughout the whole world. No wonder then, if Pride breed Diſſention, and Charity Union.* And in another place applying to Heretiques thoſe words of the Canticles: *If thou know not* (l) *thy ſelf, go forth, and follow after the ſteps of the flocks, and feed thy kids*, he ſaith: *if thou know not thy ſelf, go* (m) *thou forth, I do not caſt thee out, but go thou out, that it may be ſaid of thee: They went from us, but they were not of us. Go thou out in the ſteps of the flocks; not in my ſteps, but in the ſteps of the flocks; not of one flock, but of divers and wandring flocks; And feed thy Kids, not as Peter, to whom is ſaid, Feed thy ſheep: but feed thy kids in the Tabernacle of the Paſtors, not in the Tabernacle of the Paſtor, where there is one flock, and one Paſtor.* In which words this holy Father doth ſet down the Marks of Hereſie, to wit, *going out* from the Church, and Want of Unity among themſelves, which proceed from not acknowledging one ſupreme Viſible Paſtor and Head under Chriſt. And ſo it being Proved that Proteſtants having neither ſucceſſion of *Perſons*, nor *Doctrin*, nor *Univerſality* of *Time*, or *Place*, cannot avoid the juſt note of Hereſie.

(i) *Cap.* 24.
(k) *Lib. de Paſtor. c.* 8.
(l) *Cant.* 1.
(m) *Ep.* 48.

26 Hitherto we have brought arguments to prove, that *Luther*, and all Proteſtants are guilty of *Hereſie* againſt the *Negative* Precept of *faith*, which obligeth her under pain of damnation, not to imbrace any one errour, contrary to any Truth ſufficiently propounded, as teſtified or revealed by Almighty God. Which were enough to make good, that among Perſons who diſagree in any one Point of Faith, one part only can be ſaved: Yet we will now prove that whoſoever erreth in any one point, doth alſo break the *Affirmative* Precept of Faith, whereby we are obliged poſitively, to believe ſome revealed truth with an *infallible*, and *ſupernatural Faith*, which is neceſſary to ſalvation, even *neceſſitate finis*, or *medii*, as Divines ſpeak; that is, ſo neceſſary that not any, after he is come to the uſe of Reaſon, was or can be ſaved without it, according to the words of the Apoſtle: *Without faith* (n) *it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.*

(n) *Heb.* 11. 6.

27. In the beginning of this Chapter I ſhewed, that to Chriſtian Catholique faith are required *Certainty*, *Obſcurity*, *Prudence*, and *Supernaturality*, All which Conditions we will prove to be wanting in the belief of Proteſtants even in thoſe points which are true in themſelves, and to which they yield aſſent, as happeneth in all thoſe particulars, wherein they agree with us; from whence it will follow, that they wanting true *Divine faith*, want means abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.

28 And firſt, that their belief wanteth *Certainty* I prove, becauſe they denying the Univerſal infallibility of the Church can have no certain ground to know what Objects are revealed, or teſtified by God. Holy Scripture is in it ſelf moſt true and infallible; but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Tranſlations be faithful, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture. Every Proteſtant, as I ſuppoſe, is perſwaded that his own opinions be true, and that he hath uſed ſuch means as are wont to be preſcribed for underſtanding the Scripture, as Prayer, Conferring of divers Texts, *&c.* and yet their diſagreements ſhew that ſome of them are deceived: And therefore it is clear that they have no one certain ground whereon to relie for underſtanding of Scripture. And ſeeing they hold all the Articles of Faith, even concerning fundamental points, upon the ſelf ſame ground of Scripture, interpreted, not by the Churches Authority, according to ſome other Rules, which, as experience of their contradictions teach, do ſometimes fail; it is clear that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all. And albeit ſometime it chance to hit on the truth, yet it is likewiſe apt to lead them to error: As all Arch-heretiques believing ſome truths, and withall divers errors upon the ſame ground and motive, have indeed no true divine infallible faith, but only a fallible humane opinion, and perſwaſion. For if the ground upon which they rely were certain, it could never produce any errour.

The faith of Proteſtants wanteth Certainty.

29 Another cauſe of uncertainty in the faith of Proteſtants, muſt riſe from their diſtinction of points fundamental, and not fundamental. For ſince they acknowledge, that every error in fundamental points deſtroyeth the ſubſtance of faith, and yet cannot determine what points be fundamental, it followeth that they muſt remain uncertain whether or no they be not in ſome fundamental error, and ſo want the ſubſtance of faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation.

30 And that he who erreth againſt any one revealed truth (as certainly ſome Proteſtants muſt do, becauſe contradictory Propoſitions cannot both be true) doth loſe all *Divine faith*, is a very true doctrin delivered by Catholique Divines, with ſo general a conſent, that the contrary is wont to be cenſured as temerarious. The Angelical Doctor S. *Thomas* propoſeth this Queſtion: *Whether* (o) *he who denieth one Article of faith may retain faith in other Articles?* and reſolveth that he cannot: which he proveth, (*Argumento ſed contra*) becauſe, *As deadly ſin is oppoſite to charity; ſo to deny one Article of faith is oppoſite to faith. But charity doth not remain with any one deadly ſin; Therefore faith doth not remain after the denial of any one Article of faith.* Whereof he gives this farther reaſon: *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the nature of every habit doth depend upon the formal Motive and Object thereof, which Motive being taken away, the nature of the habit cannot remain. But the formal object of faith is the ſupreme Truth as it is manifeſted in Scriptures, and in the doctrin of the Church which proceed from the ſame ſupreme Verity. Whoſoever therefore doth not relie upon the doctrin of the Church* (*which proceeds from the ſupreme Verity, manifeſted in Scripture*) *as upon an infallible Rule, he hath not the habit of faith, but believes thoſe things which belong to faith,*

(o) 2 2 q. 5. ar. 3. *in corp.*

faith, by some other means than by faith: as, if one should remember some conclusion, and not know the reason of that demonstration, it is clear that he hath not certain Knowledge, but only Opinion. Now it is manifest, that he who relies on the doctrin of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, will yield his assent to all, that the Church teacheth. For, if among those things which she teacheth, he hold what he will, and doth not hold what he will not, he doth not relie upon the doctrin of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, but only upon his own will. And so it is clear, that an Heretique, who with pertinacity denieth one Article of faith, is not ready to follow the doctrin of the Church in all things: And therefore it is manifest, that whosoever is an Heretique in any one Article of faith, concerning other Articles, hath not faith, but a kind of Opinion, or his own Will. Thus far S. *Thomas*. And afterward: *A man doth believe* (q) *all the Articles of faith for one and the self same reason, to wit, for the Prime Verity proposed to us in the Scripture, understood aright according to the Doctrin of the Church: and therefore whosoever falls from this reason, or motive, is totally deprived of faith.* From this true doctrin we are to infer, that to retain, or want the substance of faith, doth not consist in the matter, or multitude of the Articles, but in the opposition against God's divine testimony, which is involved in every least error against faith. And since some Protestants must needs err, and that they have no certain rule to know, why rather one than another; it manifestly follows that none of them have any Certainty for the substance of their faith in any one point. Moreover D. *Potter*, being forced to confess that the *Roman* Church wants not the substance of faith, it follows that she doth not err in any one point against faith, because, as we have seen out of S. *Thomas*, every such error destroys the substance of faith. Now, if the *Roman* Church did not err in any one point of faith, it is manifest that Protestants err in all those points wherein they are contrary to her. And this may suffice to prove that the faith of Protestants wants Infallibility.

(q) *Ad. 2.*

They want the second Condition of Faith: Obscurity.

31 And now for the second Condition of faith, I say: If Protestants have *Certainty*, they want *Obscurity*, and so [illegible] not that faith, which, as the Apostle saith, is of things *not appearing*, or not necessitating our understanding to an assent. For the whole edifice of the faith of Protestants, is setled on these two Principles: These particular Books are Canonical Scripture: And the sense and meaning of these Canonical Scriptures, is clear and evident, at least in all points necessary to Salvation. Now these Principles being once supposed, it clearly followeth that what Protestants believe as necessary to salvation is evidently known by them to be true, by this argument: It is *certain* and *evident*, that whatsoever is contained in the word of God, is true. But it is *certain* and *evident*, that these Books in particular are the word of God: Therefore it is *certain* and *evident*, that whatsoever is contained in these Books is true. Which *Conclusion* I take for a *Major* in a second Argument, and say thus: It is *certain* and *evident*, that whatsoever is contained in these Books is true: But it is *certain* and *evident*, that such particular Articles (for example, The Trinity, Incarnation, Original sin, *&c.*) are contained in these Books: Therefore it is *certain* and *evident*, that these particular Objects are true. Neither will it avail you to say, that the said Principles are not evident by natural discourse, but only to *the eye of reason cleared by grace*, as you speak. For supernatural evidence, no less (yea rather more) draws and excludes *obscurity*, than natural evidence doth: neither can the party so enlightned be said voluntarily to captivate his understanding to that light, but rather his understanding is by a necessity made captive, and forced not to disbelieve, what is presented by so clear a light: And therefore your imaginary faith is not the true faith defined by the Apostle, but an invention of your own.

Their faith wants Prudence.

32 That the faith of Protestants wanteth the third Condition which was *Prudence*, is deduced from all that hitherto hath been said. What wisdom was it, to forsake a Church confessedly very ancient, and besides which, there could be demonstrated no other visible Church of Christ upon earth? A Church acknowledged to want nothing necessary to Salvation; endued with Succession of Bishops, with *Visibility* and Universality of *Time* and *Place*; A Church which if it be not the true Church, her enemies cannot pretend to have any Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Succession, *&c.* and are forced for their own sake, to maintain her perpetual Existence, and Being. To leave, I say, such a Church, and frame a Community, without either Unity, or means to procure it; a Church which at *Luther*'s first revolt had no larger extent than where his body was; a Church without *universality* of *Place or Time*; A Church which can pretend no *Visibility* or *Being*, except only in that former Church which it opposeth; a Church void of Succession of *Persons* or *Doctrin*? What wisdom was it to follow such men as *Luther*, in an opposition against the Visible Church of Christ, begun upon meer passion? What wisdom is it to receive from *us*, a Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Personal Succession, and not Succession of Doctrin? Is not this to verefie the name of *Heresie*, which signifieth *Election* or *Choice*? Whereby they cannot avoid that note of Imprudency, or (as S. *Augustine* calls it) Foolishness, set down by him against the *Manichees*, and by me recited before. *I would not* (saith he) *believe* (r) *the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Those therefore whom I obeyed, saying, Believe the Gospel, why should I not obey the same men saying to me, Do not believe Manichæus,* (Luther, Calvin, *&c.*). *chuse what thou pleasest: If thou say, Believe the Catholiques; they warn me not to believe thee. Wherefore if I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou say, Do not believe the Catholiques, thou shalt not do well, in forcing me to the faith of Manichæus, because by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Gospel it self. If thou say; you did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Gospel, but you did not well to believe them, discommending Manichæus; dost thou think me so very* FOOLISH, *that, without any reason at all, I should believe what thou wilt, and not believe, what thou wilt not?* Nay, this holy Father is not content to call it *Foolishness*, but meer *Madness*, in these words: *Why should I not most diligently enquire* (s) *what Christ commanded of those before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good thing? Canst thou better declare to me, what he said, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the Belief thereof had been recommended by thee to me? This therefore I believed by fame, strengthned with Celebrity, Consent, Antiquity. But every one may see that you, so few, so turbulent, so new, can produce nothing which deserves Authority. What* MADNESS *is this? Believe them* (Catholiques) *that we ought to believe Christ; but learn of us what Christ said, Why I beseech thee? Surely if they* (Catholiques) *were*

(r) *Cont. ep. Fund. c. 5.*

(s) *Lib de util. Cred. c. 14.*

were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more easily perswade my self, that I were not to believe Christ, then I should learn any thing concerning him from other than those, by whom I believed him. Lastly, I ask, What wisdom it could be to leave all visible Churches; and consequently the true Catholique Church of Christ, which you confess cannot err in points necessary to salvation, and the *Roman* Church which you grant doth not err in fundamentals, and follow private men who may err even in points necessary to salvation? Especially, if we add, that when *Luther* rose, there was no visible true Catholique Church besides that of *Rome*, and them who agreed with her; in which sense, she was, and is, the only true Church of Christ and not capable of any Error in faith. Nay, even *Luther*, who first opposed the *Roman* Church, yet coming to dispute against other Heretiques, he is forced to give the Lye both to his own words and deeds, in saying: *We freely confess* (t) *that in the Papacy there are many good things, worthy the name of Christian, which have come from them to us. Namely, we confess that in the Papacy there is true Scripture, true Baptism, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keyes for the remission of sins, the true office of Preaching, true Catechism, as our Lords Prayer, Ten Commandments, Articles of faith, &c.* And afterward: *I avouch, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, yea the Kern and Marrow of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints.* And again he affirmeth, that *the Church of Rome hath the true Spirit, Gospel, Faith, Baptism, Sacraments, the Keyes, the Office of Preaching, Prayer, Holy Scripture, and whatsoever Christianity ought to have.* And a little before: *I hear and see that they bring in Anabaptism only to this end, that they may spight the Pope, as men that will receive nothing from Antichrist; no otherwise than the Sacramentaries do, who therefore believe only Bread and Wine to be in the Sacrament, meerly in hatred against the Bishop of* Rome; *and they think that by this means they shall overcome the Papacy. Verily these men rely upon a weak ground, for by this means they must deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For we have all these things from the Pope, otherwise we must go make a new Scripture. O Truth, more forcible* (as S. *Austin* says) *to wring out* (x) *Confession, then is any rack, or torment!* And so we may truly say with *Moyses*: *Inimici nostri sunt Judices: Our very Enemies give* (y) *sentence for us.*

(t) *In epist. cont. Anab. ad duos Parochos to. 2. Germ. Wit. fol. 229 & 230.*

(x *Cont. Donat. post collat. c.* 24.

(y) Deut. 32. 31.

33 Lastly, since your faith wanteth *Certainty* and *Prudence*, it is easie to inferr that it wants the fourth Condition, *Supernaturality*. For being but an *Humane* perswasion, or Opinion; it is not in nature or essence *Supernatural*. And being *imprudent* and rash, it cannot proceed from Divine Motion and grace; and therefore it is neither supernatural in it *self*, nor in the *cause* from which it proceedeth.

Their faith wants Supernaturality.

34 Since therefore we have proved, that whosoever errs against any one point of faith, loseth all divine faith, even concerning those other Articles wherein he doth not err; and that although he could still retain true faith for some points, yet any one errour in whatsoever matter concerning faith, is a grievous sin; it clearly follows, that when two or more hold different doctrins concerning faith and Religion, there can be but one Part saved. For declaring of which truth, if Catholiques be charged with *want* of *Charity*, and *Modesty*, and be accused of rashness, ambition, and fury, as Mr. *Potter* is very free in this kind: I desire every one to ponder the whole words of S. *Chrysostom*, who teacheth, that every least error overthrows all faith, and whosoever is guilty thereof is in the Church, like one, who in the *Common-wealth* forgeth false coin. *Let them hear* (saith this holy Father) *what S. Paul saith: Namely, that they who brought in some small error* (z) *had overthrown the Gospel. For, to shew how small a thing ill mingled doth corrupt the whole, he said, that the Gospel was subverted. For as he who clips a little of the stamp from the King's money, makes the whole piece of no value: so whosoever takes away the least particle of sound faith, is wholly corrupted, always going from that beginning to worse things. Where then are they, who condemn us as contentious persons, because we cannot agree with Heretiques: and do often say, that there is no difference betwixt us and them, but that our disagreement proceeds from Ambition to domineer?* And thus having shewed that Protestants want true *Faith*, it remaineth that, according to my first design, I examine whether they do not also want *Charity*, as it respects a mans self.

(z) Gal. 1. 7.

The ANSWER to the SIXTH CHAPTER.

That Protestants are not Heretiques.

HE that will accuse any one man, much more any great multitude of men, of any great and horrible crime, should in all reason and justice take care that the greatness of his Evidence do equal, if not exceed, the quality of the crime. And such an accusation you would here make shew of, by pretending, first, *to lay such grounds of it, as are either already proved, or else yielded on all sides*: and after to raise a firm and stable structure of convincing arguments upon them. But both these I find to be meer and vain pretences, and having considered this Chapter also without prejudice or passion, as I did the former, I am enforc'd by the light of Truth, to pronounce your whole discourse, a painted and ruinous Building upon a weak and sandy Foundation.

Ad Sect. 1.

2 *Ad* §. 2, 3. First for your grounds; a great part of them, is falsely said to be either proved or granted. It is true indeed, that *Man by his natural wit or industry could never have attained to the knowledge of Gods will to give him a supernatural and eternal happiness*; nor of the means, by which his pleasure was to bestow this happiness upon him. And therefore your first ground is good, *That it was requisite his understanding should be enabled to apprehend that end and means, by a knowledge supernatural.* I say this is good, if you mean by *knowledge*, an apprehension or belief. But, if you take the word properly and exactly, it is both false; for faith is not knowledge, no more than three is four, but eminently contained in it: so that he that knows, believes and something more; but he that believes, many times does not know; nay, if he doth barely and meerly believe he doth never know: and besides, it is retracted by your self presently, where you require, *That the object of faith must be both naturally and supernaturally unknown.* And again in the next page, where you say, *Faith differs from science in regard of the object's obscurity.* For that science and knowledge properly taken are Synonymous terms, and that a knowledge of a thing absolutely unknown is a plain implicancy; I think, are things so plain, that you will not require any proof of them.

(a) M. *Hooker* in his answer to *Travers* his Supplication; I have taught, that the assurance of things which we believe by the word, is not so certain as of that we perceive by sense. And is it as certain? Yea I taught, that the things which God doth promise in his word are surer unto us than any thing we touch, handle, or see. But are we so sure and certain of them? If we be, why doth God so often prove his promises unto us, as he doth, by arguments taken from our sensible experience? We must be surer of the proof than the thing proved, otherwise it is no proof. How is it that if ten men do all look upon the Moon, every one of them knows it as certainly to be the Moon as another: but many believing one and the same promises, all have not one and the same fulness of perswasion? How falleth it out, that men being assured of any thing by sense can be no surer of it than they are? whereas the strongest in faith that liveth upon the earth, had alwayes need to labour, and strive, and pray, that his assurance concerning heavenly and spiritual things may grow, increase, and be augmented.

3 But then whereas you adde, *that, if such a knowledge were no more than probable, it could not be able sufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with humane probabilities, being backed with the strength of flesh and blood, and therefore conclude, that it was farther necessary, that this supernatural knowledge should be most certain and infallible:* To this I answer, that I do heartily acknowledg and believe, the Articles of our faith be in themselves Truths, as certain and infallible as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphysicks. But that there is required of us a knowledge of them, and an adherence to them, as certain as that of sense or science; that such a certainty is required of us under pain of damnation, so that no man can hope to be in the state of salvation, but he that finds in himself such a degree of faith, such a strength of adherence: This I have already demonstrated to be a great error, and of dangerous and pernitious consequence. And because I am more and more confirm'd in my perswasion that the truth which I there delivered, is of great and singular use, I will here confirm it with more reasons. And to satisfie you that this is no singularity of my own, my Margent presents you with a (a) Protestant Divine of great authority, and no way singular in his opinions, who hath long since preached and justified the same doctrin.

4 I say, that every Text of Scripture which makes mention of any that were *weak*, or of any that were *strong in faith*: of any that were *of little*, or any that were *of great faith*: of any that *abounded*, or any that were *rich* in faith; of *encreasing, growing, rooting, grounding, establishing, confirming in faith*: Every such Text, is a demonstrative refutation of this vain fancy: proving that faith, even true and saving faith, is not a thing consisting in such an

an indiviſible point of perfection as you make it, but capable of augmentation and diminution. Every prayer you make to God to increaſe your faith, or (if you conceive ſuch a prayer derogatory from the perfection of your faith,) the Apoſtles praying to Chriſt *to increaſe their faith*, is a convincing argument of the ſame concluſion. Moreover, if this doctrin of yours were true, then, ſeeing not any the leaſt doubting can conſiſt with a moſt infallible certainty, it will follow that every leaſt doubting in any matter of faith, though reſiſted and involuntary, is a damnable ſin, abſolutely deſtructive, ſo long as it laſts, of all true and ſaving faith: which you are ſo far from granting, that you make it no ſin at all, but only an occaſion of merit: and if you ſhould eſteem it a ſin, then muſt you acknowledge, contrary to your own Principles, that there are Actual ſins meerly involuntary. The ſame is furthermore invincibly confirmed by every deliberate ſin that any Chriſtian commits; by any progreſs in Charity that he makes. For ſeeing, as S. *John* aſſures us, *our faith is the victory which overcomes the world*, certainly if the faith of all true Believers were perfect, (and, if true faith be capable of no imperfection, if all faith be a knowledge moſt certain and infallible, all faith muſt be perfect; for the moſt imperfect that is, according to your doctrin, if it be true, muſt be *moſt certain*; and ſure the moſt perfect that is cannot be more than moſt certain,) then certainly their victory over the world, and therefore over the fleſh, and therefore over ſin, muſt of neceſsity be perfect, and ſo it ſhould be impoſsible for any true believer to commit any deliberate ſin, and therefore he that commits any ſin, muſt not think himſelf a true believer. Beſides, ſeeing faith worketh by Charity, and Charity is the effect of faith: certainly if the cauſe were perfect, the effect would be perfect, and conſequently as you make no degrees in Faith, ſo there would be none in Charity, and ſo no man could poſſibly make any progreſs in it, but all true believers ſhould be equal in Charity, as in faith you make them equal: and from thence it would follow unavoidably, that whoſoever finds in himſelf any true faith, muſt preſently perſwade himſelf that he is perfect in Charity: and whoſoever, on the other ſide, diſcovers in his charity any imperfection, muſt not believe that he hath any true faith. Theſe, you ſee, are ſtrange and portentous conſequences, and yet the deduction of them from your doctrin is clear and apparent; which ſhews this doctrin of yours, which you would fain have true, that there might be ſome neceſsity of your Churches infallibility, to be indeed plainly repugnant not only to Truth but even to all Religion and Piety, and fit for nothing but to make men negligent of making any progreſs in Faith or Charity. And therefore I muſt entreat and adjure you either to diſcover unto me (which I take God to witneſs I cannot perceive,) ſome fallacy in my reaſons againſt it, or never hereafter to open your mouth in defence of it.

5 As for that one ſingle reaſon which you produce to confirm it, it will appear upon examination to be reſolved finally into a groundleſs Aſſertion of your own, contrary to all Truth and experience, and that is, *That no degree of faith, leſs than a moſt certain and infallible knowledge, can be able ſufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with humane probabilities, being backt with the ſtrength of Fleſh and Blood.* For who ſees not that many millions in the world forgo many times their preſent eaſe and pleaſure, undergo great and toilſom labours, encounter great difficulties, adventure upon great dangers, and all this not upon any certain expectation, but upon a pro-

bable hope of ſome future gain and commodity, and that not infinite and eternal, but finite and temporal? Who ſees not that many men abſtain from many things they exceedingly deſire, not upon any certain aſſurance, but a probable fear of danger that may come after? What man ever was there ſo madly in love with a preſent penny, but that he would willingly ſpend it upon any little hope that by doing ſo he might gain an hundred thouſand pound? And I would fain know, *what gay probabilities* you could deviſe to diſſwade him from this Reſolution. And, if you can deviſe none, what reaſon then, or ſenſe is there, but that a probable hope of infinite and eternal happineſs, provided for all thoſe that obey *Chriſt Jeſus*, & much more a firm faith, though not ſo certain, in ſome ſort, as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to ſway our will to obedience, and encounter with all thoſe temptations which Fleſh and Blood can ſuggeſt to avert us from it? Men may talk their pleaſure of an abſolute and moſt infallible certainty, but did they generally believe that obedience to Chriſt were the only way to preſent and eternal felicity, but as firmly and undoubtedly as that there is ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*, nay but as much as *Cæſar*'s Commentaries, or the Hiſtory of *Saluſt*; I believe the lives of moſt men, both Papiſts and Proteſtants would be better than they are. Thus therefore out of your own words I argue againſt you: He that requires to true faith, an abſolute and infallible certainty, for this only Reaſon *becauſe any leſs degree, could not be able to overbear our will*, &c. imports, that if a leſs degree of faith were able to do this, then a leſs degree of faith may be true and divine and ſaving Faith: But, experience ſhews, and reaſon confirms, that a firm faith, though not ſo certain as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to encounter and overcome our will and affections: And therefore it follows from your own reaſon, that faith, which is not a moſt certain and infallible knowledge, may be true and divine and ſaving faith.

6 All theſe Reaſons I have imployed to ſhew that ſuch a moſt certain and infallible faith as here you talk of, is not ſo neceſſary, but that without ſuch a high degree of it, it is poſſible to pleaſe God. And therefore the Doctrin delivered by you §. 25. are moſt preſumptuous and uncharitable: *viz. That ſuch a moſt certain and infallible faith is neceſſary to ſalvation, Neceſſitate Finis, or Medii*; ſo neceſſary, that *after a man is come to the uſe of reaſon, no man ever was or can be ſaved without it*. Wherein you boldly intrude into the judgment-ſeat of God, and damn men for breaking Laws, not of God's but your own making. But withall, you clearly contradict your ſelf, not only where you affirm, *That your faith depends finally upon the Tradition of Age to Age, of Father to Son*, which cannot be a fit ground, but only for a Moral Aſſurance; nor only, where you pretend, that *not alone Hearing and Seeing*, but alſo *Hiſtories, Letters, Relations of many* (which certainly are things not certain and infallible,) *are yet foundations good enough to ſupport your faith*; Which Doctrin, if it were good and allowable, Proteſtants might then hope that their Hiſtories, and Letters, and Relations might alſo paſs for means ſufficient of a ſufficient Certainty, & that they ſhould not be excluded from Salvation for want of ſuch a Certainty. But indeed the preſſure of the preſent difficulty compell'd you to ſpeak here, what I believe you will not juſtifie, & with a pretty tergiverſation to ſhew D. *Potter* your means of moral certainty; whereas the Objection was, that you had no means or poſſibility of infallible certainty, for which you are plainly at as great a loſs, and as far to ſeek, as any of your Adverſaries. And therefore it

concerns

concerns you highly not to damn others for want of it, leſt you involve your ſelves in the ſame condemnation; according to thoſe terrible words of S. *Paul, Thou art inexcuſable, O Man, whoſoever thou art that judgeſt: For, wherein thou judgeſt another, thou condemneſt thy ſelf; for thou that judgeſt doſt the ſame things*, &c. In this therefore you plainly contradict your ſelf. And laſtly moſt plainly, in ſaying as you do here, you contradict and retract your pretence of Charity to Proteſtants in the beginning of your Book: For there you make profeſſion, that *you have no aſſurance but that Proteſtants dying Proteſtants, may poſſibly die with contrition, and be ſaved*: And here you are very peremptory, that *they cannot but want a means abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, and wanting that cannot but be damned.*

7 The third Condition you require to faith, is, that our aſſent to divine Truths ſhould *not only be unknown and unevident by any humane diſcourſe*, but that *abſolutely alſo it ſhould be obſcure in it ſelf, and, ordinarily ſpeaking, be void even of ſupernatural evidence.* Which words muſt have a very favourable conſtruction, or elſe they will not be ſenſe. For who can make any thing of theſe words taken properly, that *faith muſt be an unknown unevident aſſent or an aſſent abſolutely obſcure?* I had always thought, that known and unknown, obſcure and evident had been affections, not of our Aſſent, but the Object of it, not of our belief, but the thing believed. For well may we aſſent to a thing unknown, obſcure, or unevident; but that our aſſent it ſelf ſhould be called therefore unknown or obſcure, ſeems to me as great an impropriety, as if I ſhould ſay, Your ſight were green or blew, becauſe you ſee ſomething that is ſo. In other places, therefore, I anſwer your words, but here I muſt anſwer your meaning: which I conceive to be, That it is neceſſary to faith that the Objects of it, the points which we believe, ſhould not be ſo evidently certain, as to neceſſitate our underſtanding to an Aſſent, that ſo there might be ſome merit in faith, as you love to ſpeak (who will not receive no not from God himſelf, but a penny-worth for a penny,) but, as we, ſome obedience in it, which can hardly have place where there is no poſſibility of diſobedience; as there is not, where the underſtanding does all, and the will nothing. Now ſeeing the Religion of Proteſtants, though it be much more credible than yours, yet is not pretended to have the abſolute evidence of ſenſe or demonſtration; therefore I might let this doctrin paſs without exception, for any prejudice that can redound to us by it. But yet I muſt not forbear to tell you; that your diſcourſe proves indeed this condition requiſite to the merit, but yet not to the eſſence of faith: without it faith were not an act of obedience, but yet faith may be faith without it; and this you muſt confeſs, unleſs you will ſay either the Apoſtles believed not the whole Goſpel which they preached, or that they were not eywitneſſes of a great part of it: un'eſs you will queſtion S. *John* for ſaying *that which we have ſeen with our eys, & which our hands have handled*, &c. *declare we unto you*: nay our Saviour himſelf for ſaying, *Thomas becauſe thou ſeeſt, thou believeſt, Bleſſed are they which have not ſeen & yet have believed.* Yet, if you will ſay that in reſpect of the things which they ſaw, the Apoſtles aſſent was not pure and proper and meer faith, but ſomewhat more; an aſſent containing faith but ſuperadding to it, I will not contend with you; for it will be a contention about words. But then again I muſt crave leave to tell you, that the requiring this condition, is in my judgment a plain revocation of the former. For had you made the matter of faith either naturally or ſupernaturally

evident, it might have been a fitly attempered and duly proportioned object for an absolute certainty natural or supernatural: But requiring as you do, *that faith should be an absolute knowledge of a thing not absolutely known, an infallible certainty of a thing, which, though it be in it self, yet it is not made appear to us to be, infallibly certain,* to my understanding you speak impossibilities. And truly for one of your Religion to do so, is but a good *Decorum*. For the matter and object of your Faith being so full of contradictions, a contradictious faith may very well become a contradictious Religion. Your faith therefore, if you please to have it so, let it be a free necessitated, certain uncertain, evident obscure, prudent and foolish, natural and supernatural unnatural assent. But they which are unwilling to believe nonsense themselves, or to perswade others to do so, it is but reason they should make the faith wherewith they believe, an intelligible, composible, consistent thing, & not define it by repugnancies. Now nothing is more repugnant, than that a man should be required to give most certain credit unto that which cannot be made appear most certainly credible: and, if it appear to him to be so, then is it not obscure that it is so. For, if you speak of an acquired, rational, discursive faith, certainly these Reasons which make the object seem credible, must be the cause of it, and consequently the strength and firmity of my assent must rise and fall, together with the apparent credibility of the object. If you speak of a supernatural infused faith, then you either suppose it infused by the former means, and then that which was said before must be said again: for whatsoever effect is wrought meerly by means, must bear proportion to, and cannot exceed the vertue of the means, by which it is wrought: As nothing by water can be made more cold than water, nor by fire more hot than fire, nor by honey more sweet than honey, nor by gall more bitter than gall: Or, if you will suppose it infused without means, then that power which infuseth into the understanding assent which bears Analogy to sight in the eye, must also infuse Evidence, that is, Visibility into the Object: and look what degree of assent is infus'd into the understanding, at least the same degree of evidence must be infused into the Object. And for you to require a strength of credit beyond the appearance of the object's credibility, is all one as if you should require me to go ten miles an hour upon an horse that will go but five: to discern a man certainly through a myst or cloud that makes him not certainly discernable; to hear a sound more clearly than it is audible; to understand a thing more fully than it is intelligible: and he that doth so, I may well expect that his next injunction will be, that I must see something that is invisible, hear something inaudible, understand something that is wholly unintelligible. For he that demands ten of me, knowing I have but five, does in effect, as if he demanded five, knowing that I have none: and by like reason, you requiring that I should see things farther then they are visible, require I should see something invisible; and in requiring that I believe something more firmly than it is made to me evidently credible, you require in effect that I believe some thing which appears to me incredible, and while it does so. I deny not but that I am bound to believe the truth of many Texts of Scripture, the sense whereof is to me obscure; and the truth of many Articles of faith, the manner whereof is obscure, and to humane understandings incomprehensible; But then it is to be observed, that not the sense of such Texts, not the manner of these things is that which I am bound

to

to believe, but the truth of them. But that I ſhould believe the truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be made evident with an evidence proportionable to the degree of faith required of me, this I ſay for any man to be bound to, is unjuſt and unreaſonable, becauſe to do it is impoſſible.

8 *Ad Q.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 9, 10, 11, *&* 12. Yet though I deny that it is required of us to be certain in the higheſt degree, infallibly certain of the truth of the things which we believe (for this were to know and not believe, neither is it poſſible unleſs our evidence of it, be it natural or ſupernatural, were of the higheſt degree;) yet I deny not, but we ought to be and may be infallibly certain that we are to believe the Religion of Chriſt. For firſt, this is moſt certain, that we are in all things to do according to wiſdom and reaſon, rather than againſt it. Secondly this is as certain, That wiſdom and Reaſon require, that we ſhould believe thoſe things which are by many degrees more credible and probable than the contrary. Thirdly, this is as certain, that to every man who conſiders impartially what great things may be ſaid for the truth of Chriſtianity, and what poor things they are which may be ſaid againſt it, either for any other Religion or for none at all, it cannot but appear by many degrees more credible, that Chriſtian Religion is true, than the contrary. And from all theſe premiſſes, this concluſion evidently follows, that it is infallibly certain, that we are firmly to believe the truth of Chriſtian Religion.

9 Your diſcourſe therefore touching the fourth requiſite to faith which is Prudence, I admit ſo far as to grant. 1. That if we were required to believe with certainty (I mean a Moral certainty,) things no way repreſented as infallible and certain (I mean morally,) an unreaſonable obedience were required of us. And ſo likewiſe were it, were we required to believe as abſolutely certain, that which is no way repreſented to us as abſolutely certain. 2. That whom God obligeth to believe any thing, he will not fail to furniſh their underſtandings with ſuch inducements, as are ſufficient (if they be not negligent or perverſe) to perſwade them to believe. 3. That there is an abundance of Arguments exceedingly credible, inducing men to believe the Truth of Chriſtianity: I ſay ſo credible, that though they cannot make us evidently ſee what we believe, yet they evidently convince that in true wiſdom and prudence, the Articles of it deſerve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. 4. That without ſuch reaſons and inducements, our choice even of the true faith, is not to be commended as prudent, but to be condemned of raſhneſs and levity.

10 But then for your making Prudence, not only a commendation of a believer, and a juſtification of his faith, but alſo eſſential to it, and part of the definition of it, in that queſtionleſs you were miſtaken, and have done as if being to ſay what a man is, you ſhould define him, A Reaſonable creature that hath skill in Aſtronomy. For as all Aſtronomers are men, but all men are not Aſtronomers, and therefore Aſtronomy ought not to be put into the definition of Men, where nothing ſhould have place, but what agrees to all men: So though all that are truly wiſe (that is, wiſe for eternity,) will believe aright, yet many may believe aright which are not wiſe. I could wiſh with all my heart, as *Moſes* did, *that all the Lords people could Propheſie:* That all that believe the true Religion *were able* (according to S. *Peter*'s injunction) *to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*, a reaſon why they hope for eternal happineſs by this way rather than any other! neither do I think it any great

difficulty that men of ordinary capacities, if they would give their mind to it, might quickly be enabled to do ſo. But ſhould I affirm that all true believers can do ſo, I ſuppoſe it would be as much againſt experience and modeſty, as it is againſt Truth and Charity, to ſay as you do, that *they which cannot do ſo, either are not at all, or to no purpoſe true believers.* And thus we ſee that the foundations you build upon, are ruinous and deceitful, and ſo unfit to ſupport your Fabrick that they deſtroy one another. I come now to ſhew that your Arguments to prove Proteſtants Heretiques, are all of the ſame quality with your former grounds: which I will do, by oppoſing clear and ſatisfying Anſwers in order to them.

11 *Ad §.* 13. To the firſt then, delivered by you §. 13. *That Proteſtants muſt be Heretiques, becauſe they oppoſed divers Truths propounded for divine by the Viſible Church:* I anſwer, It is not hereſie to oppoſe any truth propounded by the Church, but only ſuch a Truth as is an eſſential part of the Goſpel of Chriſt. 2. The Doctrins which Proteſtants oppoſed, were not Truths, but plain and impious falſhoods: Neither, thirdly, were they propounded as Truths by the Viſible Church, but only by a Part of it, and that a corrupted Part.

12 *Ad §.* 14. The next *Argument, in the next Particle tell us,* That every *error againſt any doctrin revealed by God is damnable Hereſie: Now either Proteſtants or the Roman Church muſt err againſt the word of God: But the Roman Church* we *grant (perforce) doth not err damnably, neither can ſhe, becauſe ſhe is the Catholique Church, which* we (you ſay) *confeſs cannot err damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt err againſt God's word, and conſequently are guilty of formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I anſwer plainly, that there be in this argument almoſt as many falſhoods as aſſertions. For neither is every error againſt any Doctrin revealed by God a damnable Hereſie, unleſs it be revealed publiquely and plainly with a command that all ſhould believe it. 2. D. *Potter* no where grants, that the Errors of the Roman Church are *not in themſelves damnable,* though he hopes by accident they may not actually damn ſome men amongſt you: and this you your ſelf confeſs in divers places of your Book, where you tell us, that he *allows no hope of Salvation to thoſe amongſt you, whom ignorance cannot excuſe.* 3. You beg the Queſtion twice in taking for granted, Firſt, That *the Roman Church is the truly Catholique Church,* which without much favour can hardly paſs for a part of it. And again, that the *Catholique Church cannot fall into any error of it ſelf damnable*; for it may do ſo, and ſtill be the Catholique Church, if it retain thoſe Truths which may be an antidote againſt the malignity of this error, to thoſe that held it out of a ſimple un-affected ignorance. Laſtly, though the thing be true, yet I might well require ſome proof of it from you, that either Proteſtants or the Roman Church muſt err againſt God's word. For, if their contradiction be your only reaſon, then alſo you or the *Dominicans* muſt be Heretiques, becauſe you contradict one another as much as Proteſtants and Papiſts.

13 *Ad §.* 15. The third Argument, pretends that *you have ſhewed already, that the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies, and therefore infallible, from whence you ſuppoſe that it follows, that to oppoſe her, is to oppoſe God.* To which I anſwer, that you have ſaid only, and not ſhewed, that *the Viſible Church is Judg of Controverſies.* And indeed how can ſhe be Judge of them if ſhe cannot decide them? And how can ſhe decide them, if it be a queſtion

Whether ſhe be judge of them? That which is queſtion'd it ſelf cannot with any ſenſe be pretended to be fit to decide other queſtions; and much leſs this queſtion, Whether it have Authority to judge and decide all queſtions? 2. If ſhe were Judge, it would not follow that ſhe were infallible; for we have many Judges in our Courts of Judicature, yet none infallible. Nay, you cannot with any modeſty deny, that every man in the world ought to judge for himſelf, what Religion is trueſt; and yet you will not ſay that every man is infallible. 3. If the Church were ſuppoſed infallible, yet it would not follow at all, much leſs manifeſtly, that to oppoſe her Declaration, is to oppoſe God: unleſs you ſuppoſe alſo that as ſhe is infallible, ſo by her oppoſers, ſhe is known or believed to be ſo. Laſtly, If all this were true (as it is all moſt falſe) yet were it to little purpoſe, ſeeing you have omitted to prove that the Viſible Church is the *Roman*.

14 *Ad* §. 16. Inſtead of a fourth Argument this is preſented to us, *That, if* Luther *were an Heretique, then they that agreed with him muſt be ſo.* And that *Luther* was a formal Heretique, you endeavour to prove by this moſt formal Syllogiſm; *To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal, is properly an Hereſie: But* Luther's *Reformation was not Univerſal: Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I Anſwer, firſt to the firſt part, that it is no way impoſſible that *Luther*, had he been the inventor and firſt broacher of a falſe Doctrin, (as he was not) might have been a formal Heretique, and yet that thoſe who follow him may be only ſo materially and improperly, and indeed no Heretiques. Your own men out of St. *Auſtin* diſtinguiſh between *Hæretici & Hæreticorum ſequaces*: And you your ſelf though you pronounce *the leaders among the* Arrians *formal Heretiques*, yet confeſs that *Salvian* was at leaſt doubtful whether thoſe Arrians, who in ſimplicity followed their Teachers, might not be excuſed by ignorance. And about this ſuſpenſion of his you alſo ſeem ſuſpended; for you neither approve nor condemn it. Secondly, to the ſecond part, I ſay, that, had you not preſumed upon our ignorance in Logick as well as Metaphyſicks and School-Divinity, you would never have obtruded upon us this rope of ſand for a formal Syllogiſm. It is even Coſen-German to this, To deny the Reſurrection is properly an Hereſie, But *Luther*'s Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie! Or to this, To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal is properly an Hereſie: But the preaching of the Goſpel at the beginning was not Univerſal: Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie. For as he whoſe Reformation is but particular, may yet not deny the Reſurrection, ſo may he alſo not deny the Churches Univerſality. And as the Apoſtles who preached the Goſpel in the beginning, did believe the Church Univerſal, though their preaching at the beginning was not ſo: So *Luther* alſo might and did believe the Church Univerſal, though his Reformation were but particular. I ſay, he did believe it Univerſal, even in your own ſenſe, that is, Univerſal *de jure*, though not *de facto*. And as for Univerſality in fact, he believed the Church much more Univerſal than his Reformation: For he did conceive (as appears by your own Allegations out of him) that not only the Part reformed was the true Church, but alſo that they were Part of it who needed Reformation. Neither did he ever pretend to make a new Church but to reform the old one. Thirdly and laſtly, to the firſt propoſition of this unſyllogiſtical ſyllogiſm, I anſwer, That to ſay the true Church

is

is not always *de facto* universal, is so far from being an Heresie, that it is a certain truth known to all those that know the world, and what Religions possess far the greater part of it. *Donatus* therefore was not to blame, for saying, that the Church might possibly be confin'd to *Africk*; but for saying without ground, that then it was so. And S. *Augustin*, as he was in the right, in thinking that the Church was then extended farther than *Africk*; so was he in the wrong, if he thought that of necessity it alwayes must be so; but most palpably mistaken in conceiving that it was then spread over the whole earth, and known to all nations; which, if passion did not trouble you, and make you forget how lately almost half the world was discovered, and in what estate it was then found, you would very easily see and confess.

15 *Ad §.* 17. In the next Section you pretend *that you have no desire to prosecute the similitude of Protestants with the Donatists*; and yet you do it with as much spight and malice as could well be devised, but in vain: For *Lucilla* might do ill in promoting the Sect of the Donatists, and yet the mother and the daughter, whom you glance at, might do well in *ministring influence* (as you phrase it) *to Protestants in England*. Unless you will conclude, because one woman did one thing ill, therefore no woman can do any thing well: or because it was ill done to promote one Sect, therefore it must be ill done, to maintain any.

16 The *Donatists might do ill in calling the Chair of* Rome *the Chair of Pestilence, and the Roman Church an Harlot*; and yet, the state of the Church being altered, Protestants might do well to do so: and therefore though S. *Austin might perhaps have reason to persecute the Donatists for detracting from the Church*, and calling her harlot, when she was not so; yet you may have none to threaten D. *Potter* that you would persecute him (as the Application of this place intimates you would,) if it were in your power: plainly shewing that you are a curst Cow though your horns be short, seeing the Roman Church is not now what it was in S. *Austin*'s time. And hereof the conclusion of your own book affords us a very pregnant testimony: where you tell us out of Saint *Austin*, that one grand impediment, which among many kept the seduced followers of the faction of *Donatus* from the Churches Communion, was, a calumny raised against the Catholiques, That *they did set some strange thing upon their Altar. To how many* (saith S. *Austin*) *did the reports of ill tongues shut up the way to enter, who said, that we put I know not what upon the Altar?* Out of detestation of the calumny, and just indignation against it, he would not so much as name the impiety wherewith they were charged, and therefore by a Rhetorical figure calls it, *I know not what*. But compare with him *Optatus*, writing of the same matter, and you shall plainly perceive that this (*I know not what*) pretended to be set upon the Altar, was indeed a Picture, which the Donatists (knowing how detestable a thing it was to all Christians at that time, to set up any Pictures in a Church to worship them, as your new fashion is) bruited abroad to be done in the Churches of the Catholique Church. But what answer doth S. *Austin* and *Optatus* make to this Accusation? Do they confess and maintain it? Do they say, as you would now, It is true we do set Pictures upon our Altar, and that not only for ornament or memory, but for worship also; but we do well to do so, and this ought not to trouble you, or affright you from our Communion? What other answer your Church, could now make to such an objection, is

very

very hard to imagine: And therefore were your Doctrin the ſame with the Doctrin of the Fathers in this point, they muſt have anſwered ſo likewiſe. But they to the contrary not only deny the crime, but abhorr and deteſt it. To little purpoſe therefore do you hunt after theſe poor ſhadows of reſemblances between us and the *Donatiſts*: unleſs you could ſhew an exact reſemblance between the preſent Church of *Rome* and the ancient: which ſeeing by this, and many other particulars, it is demonſtrated to be impoſſible; that Church which was then a Virgin may be now a Harlot, and that which was detraction in the *Donatiſts*, may be in Proteſtants a juſt accuſation.

17 As ill ſucceſs have you in comparing D. *Potter* with *Tyconius* whom as S. *Auſtin finds fault with for continuing in the Donatiſts ſeparation, having forſaken the ground of it, the Doctrin of the Churches periſhing: ſo you condemn the Doctor, for continuing in their communion, who hold* (as you ſay) *the very ſame Hereſie.* But if this were indeed the Doctrin of the *Donatiſts*, how is it that you ſay preſently after, *that the Proteſtants who hold the Church of Chriſt periſhed, were worſe than Donatiſts, who ſaid that the Church remained at leaſt in* Africa? Theſe things me-thinks hang not well together. But to let this paſs; The truth is, this difference, for which you would fain raiſe ſuch a horrible diſſention between D. *Potter* and his Brethren, if it be well conſidered is only in words and the mannner of expreſſion: They affirming only, that the Church periſhed from its integrity, and fell into many corruptions which he denies not: Aud the Doctor denying only that it fell from its eſſence, and became no Church at all, which they affirm not.

18 Theſe therefore are but velitations, and you would ſeem to make but ſmall account of them. But the main point you ſay is, that *ſince* Luther's *Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before* Luther, *and yet was in the Apoſtles time, they muſt of neceſſity affirm heretically with the Donatiſts, that the true unſpotted Church of Chriſt periſhed, and that ſhe which remained on earth, was* (*O Blaſphemy!*) *an Harlot.* By which words it ſeems you are reſolute perpetually to confound *True* and *Unſpotted*; and to put no difference between a corrupted Church and none at all. But what is this, but to make no difference between a diſeaſed and a dead man? Nay what is it but to contradict your ſelves, who cannot deny but that ſins are as great ſtains and ſpots and deformities in the ſight of God, as errours; and confeſs your Church to be a congregation of men, whereof every particular, not one excepted, (and conſequently the generality which is nothing but a collection of them) is polluted and defiled with ſin? You proceed.

19 But, ſay you, *The ſame hereſie follows out of D.* Potter *and other Proteſtants, that the Church may err in points not fundamental; becauſe we have ſhewed that every error againſt any revealed truth is Hereſie and Damnable, whether the matter be great or ſmall: And how can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, than when ſhe is permitted to maintain damnable Hereſie? Beſides, we will hereafter prove that by every act of Hereſie all divine faith is loſt, and to maintain a true Church without any faith, is to fancy a living man without life.* Anſ. What you have ſaid before, hath been anſwered before; and what you ſhall ſay hereafter, ſhall be confuted hereafter. But if it be ſuch a certain ground, that *every error againſt any one revealed truth is a damnable Hereſie*, then, I hope I ſhall have your leave to ſubſume, That

the

the Dominicans in your account muſt hold a damnable hereſie, who hold an error againſt the immaculate Conception: which you muſt needs eſteem a revealed truth, or otherwiſe why are you ſo urgent and importunate to have it defined? ſeeing your rule is, *Nothing may be defined, unleſs it be firſt revealed.* But, without your leave, I will make bold to conclude, that, if either that or the contrary aſſertion be a revealed truth, you or they, chuſe you whether, muſt without contradiction hold a damnable Hereſie: if this ground be true that every contradiction of a revealed Truth is ſuch. And now I dare ſay, for fear of inconvenience you will begin to temper the crudeneſs of your former aſſertion, and tell us, that neither of you are Heretiques, becauſe the Truth againſt which you err though revealed, is not ſufficiently propounded. And ſo ſay I, Neither is your doctrin which Proteſtants contradict ſufficiently propounded. For though it be plain enough, that your Church propoſeth it, yet ſtill, me-thinks, it is as plain that your Churches propoſition is not ſufficient; and I deſire you would not ſay but prove the contrary. Laſtly, to your Queſtion, *How can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, than when ſhe is permitted to maintain a damnable Hereſie?* I Anſwer, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe is not only permitted to do ſo, but *de facto* doth maintain a damnable Hereſie. Again, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe falls into an Hereſie, which is not only damnable in it ſelf, and *ex natura rei*, as you ſpeak, but ſuch an Hereſie, the belief of whoſe contrary Truth is neceſſary, not only *neceſſitate præcepti* but *medii*, and therefore the Hereſie ſo abſolutely and indiſpenſably deſtructive of ſalvation, that no ignorance can excuſe it, nor any general repentance, without a dereliction of it, can beg a pardon for it. Such an hereſie if the Church ſhould fall into, it might be more truly ſaid to periſh, then if it fell only into ſome hereſie of its own nature damnable. For, in that ſtate, all the members of it, without exception, all without mercy muſt needs periſh for ever: In this, although thoſe that might ſee the truth and would not, cannot upon any good ground hope for ſalvation, yet without queſtion, it might ſend many ſouls to heaven, who would gladly have embrac'd the truth, but that they wanted means to diſcover it. Thirdly and laſtly, ſhe may yet more truly be ſaid to periſh when ſhe Apoſtates from Chriſt abſolutely, or rejects even thoſe Truths out of which her Hereſies may be reformed; as if ſhe ſhould directly deny *Jeſus to be the Chriſt*, or the Scripture to be the Word of God. Towards which ſtate of Perdition it may well be feared that the Church of *Rome* doth ſomewhat incline, by her ſuperinducing upon the reſt of her errors the Doctrin of her own infallibility, whereby her errors are made incurable; & by her pretending that the Scripture is to be interpreted according to her doctrin, and not her doctrin to be judg'd of by Scripture, whereby ſhe makes the Scripture uneffectual for her Reformation.

20. *Ad §.* 18. I was very glad when I heard you ſay *The Holy Scripture and antient Fathers do aſſign Separation from the viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie*: for I was in good hope, that no Chriſtian would ſo belie the Scripture, as to ſay ſo of it, unleſs he could have produced ſome one Text at leaſt, wherein this was plainly affirmed, or from whence it might be undoubtedly and undeniably collected. For aſſure your ſelf, good Sir, it is a very hainous crime to ſay, *Thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo.* I expected therefore ſome Scripture ſhould have been alledged, wherein it

ſhould

should have been said, *Whosoever separates from the Roman Church is an Heretique*: or *the Roman Church is infallible*, or *the Guide of faith*: or, at least, *There shall be always some visible Church infallible in matters of faith.* Some such direction as this I hoped for: And, I pray consider, whether I had not reason! The Evangelists and Apostles who wrote the new Testament, we all suppose were good men, and very desirous to direct us the surest and plainest way to heaven; we suppose them likewise very sufficiently instructed by the Spirit of God in all the necessary points of the Christian faith, and therefore certainly not ignorant of this *Unum Necessarium*, this most necessary point of all others, without which, as you pretend and teach, all faith is no Faith, that is, that *the Church of Rome was designed by God the guide of Faith.* We suppose them lastly wise men, especially being assisted by the spirit of wisdom, and such as knew that a doubtful and questionable Guide was for mens direction as good as none at all. And after all these suppositions, which I presume no good Christian will call into question, is it possible that any Christian heart can believe, that not One amongst them all should *ad rei memoriam* write this necessary doctrin, plainly so much as once? Certainly in all reason they had provided much better for the good of Christians, if they had wrote this, though they had writ nothing else. Me-thinks, the Evangelists, undertaking to write the Gospel of Christ, could not possibly have omitted, any one of them, this most necessary point of faith, had they known it necessary, (S. *Luke* especially, who plainly professes that *his intent was to write all things necessary.*) Me-thinks S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* could not but have congratulated this their Priviledge to them! Me-thinks, instead of saying, *Your faith is spoken of, all the world over* (which you have no reason to be very proud of, for he says the very same thing to the *Thessalonians*,) he could not have fail'd to have told them, once at least in plain terms, that *their Faith was the Rule for all the World for ever.* But then sure he would have forborn to put them in fear of an impossibility, as he doth in his eleventh Chapter, that they also, nay the whole Church of the *Gentiles, if they did not look to their standing, might fall away to infidelity*, as the Jews had done. Me-thinks, in all his other Epistles, at least in some, at least in one of them, he could not have failed to have given the world this direction, had he known it to be a true one, that *all men were to be guided by the Church of Rome, and none to separate from it under pain of damnation.* Me-thinks writing so often of Heretiques and Antichrist, he should have given the world this (as you pretend) only sure preservative from them. How was it possible that S. *Peter* writing two Catholick Epistles, mentioning his own departure, writing to preserve Christians in the faith, should in neither of them commend them to the guidance of his pretended Successours, the Bishops of *Rome?* How was it possible that S. *James*, and S. *Jude* in their Catholique Epistles should not give this Catholique direction? Me-thinks, S. *John* instead of saying, *He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*, (The force of which direction your glosses do quite enervate, and make unavailable to discern who are the sons of God,) should have said, *He that adheres to the doctrin of the Roman Church, and lives according to it, he is a good Christian, and by this mark ye shall know him!* What man not quite out of his wits, if he consider as he should, the pretended necessity of this doctrin, that without the belief hereof no man ordinarily can be saved, can possibly force himself to conceive that all these good and holy men, so desirous of mens salvation,

and

and ſo well aſſured of it (as it is pretended,) ſhould be ſo deeply and affectedly ſilent in it, and not One of them ſay it plainly ſo much as once, but leave it to be collected from uncertain Principles, by many more uncertain Conſequences? Certainly, he that can judge ſo uncharitably of them, it is no marvel if he cenſure other inferiour ſervants of Chriſt as Atheiſts, and Hypocrites, and what he pleaſes. Plain places therefore I did and had reaſon to look for, when I heard you ſay, *the holy Scripture aſſigns ſeparation from the viſible Church as a Mark of Hereſie.* But inſtead hereof what have you brought us, but meer impertinencies? S. *John* ſaith of ſome who pretended to be Chriſtians and were not ſo, and therefore when it was for their advantage forſook their profeſſion, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.* Of ſome, who before the decree of the Councel to the contrary, were perſwaded and accordingly taught, that the convert Gentiles were to keep the Law of *Moſes*, it is ſaid in the Acts, *Some who went out from us.* And again S. *Paul* in the ſame book forwarns the Epheſians that *out of them ſhould ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things.* And from theſe places, which it ſeems are the plaineſt you have, you collect, *that ſeparation from the Viſible Church is aſſigned by Scripture as a Mark of Hereſie.* Which is certainly a ſtrange and unheard-of ſtrain of Logick. Unleſs you will ſay that every Text wherein it is ſaid, that ſome body goes out from ſome body, affords an Argument for this purpoſe! For the firſt place, there is no certainty that it ſpeaks of Heretiques; but, *no Chriſtians*, of *Antichriſts*, *of ſuch as denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt*: See the place and you ſhall confeſs as much. The ſecond place, it is certain, you muſt not ſay it ſpeaks of Heretiques; for it ſpeaks only of ſome who believed and taught an Error, while it was yet a queſtion, and not evident, and therefore according to your doctrin no formal Hereſie. The third ſaies indeed, that of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, ſome ſhall ariſe that ſhall teach Hereſie: But not one of them all that ſays or intimates, that whoſoever ſeparates from the Viſible Church in what ſtate ſoever, is certainly an heretique. Heretiques, I confeſs, do always do ſo; But they that do ſo, are are not always Heretiques; for perhaps the ſtate of the Church may make it neceſſary for them to do ſo; as Rebels always diſobey the command of their King, yet they, which diſobey a King's command (which perhaps may be unjuſt) are not preſently Rebels.

21 Your Allegations out of *Vincentius*, *Proſper*, and *Cyprian*, are liable to theſe exceptions. 1. That they are the ſayings of men not aſſiſted by the Spirit of God, and whoſe Authority your ſelves will not ſubmit to in all things. 2. That the firſt and laſt are meerly impertinent, neither of them affirming or intimating, that ſeparation from the preſent Viſible Church is a mark of Hereſie: and the former ſpeaking plainly of ſeparation from Univerſality, Conſent, and Antiquity, which, if you will preſume without proof that we did and you did not, you beg the Queſtion. For you know we pretend that we ſeparated only from that preſent Church which had ſeparated from the doctrin of the Ancient, and becauſe ſhe had done ſo, and ſo far forth as ſhe had done ſo & no farther. And laſtly, the latter part of *Proſpers* words cannot be generally true, according to your own grounds; For you ſay a man may be divided from the Church upon meer Schiſm without any mixture of Hereſie: And a man may be juſtly excommunicated for many other ſufficient cauſes beſides Hereſie. Laſtly, a man may be divided by an unjuſt excom-

excommunication, and be both before and after a very good Catholique; and therefore you cannot maintain it Universally true, *That he who is divided from the Church, is an Heretique, and Antichrist.*

22. In the 19. §. we have the Authority of eight Fathers urg'd to prove *That the separation from the Church of* Rome, *as it is the See of S.* Peter, (I conceive you mean, as it is that particular Church) *is the mark of Heresie.* Which kind of argument I might well refuse to answer, unless you would first promise me, that whensoever I should produce as plain sentences, of as great a number of Fathers as ancient, for any doctrin whatsoever, that you will subscribe to it, though it fall out to be contrary to the doctrin of the *Roman* Church. For I conceive nothing in the world more unequal or unreasonable, then that you should press us with such Authorities as these, and think your selves at liberty from them; and that you should account them Fathers when they are for you, and Children when they are against you. Yet I would not you should interpret this as if I had not great assurance, that it is not possible for you ever to gain this cause at the tribunal of the Fathers; nay, not of the Fathers, whose sentences are here alleadged. Let us consider them in order, and I doubt not to make it appear that far the greater part of them; nay, al of them that are any way considerable fal short of your purpose.

23. *S. Hierome* (you say) *writing to Pope* Damasus, saith, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *&c.* But then I pray consider he saith it to Pope *Damasus:* and this will much weaken the Authority, with them who know how great over-truths men usually write to one another in Letters. Consider again, that he says only, that *he was then in Communion with the Chair of* Peter, Not that he alwayes would, or of necessity must be so: for his resolution to the contrary is too evident out of that which he saith elsewhere which shall be produced hereafter. He says, that the *Church at that present was built upon that Rock*; but, Not that only, Nor that alwayes. Nay his judgment, as shall appear, is express to the contrary. And so likewise the rest of his expressions (if we mean to reconcile *Hierome* with *Hierome*) must be conceived as intended by him, of that Bishop and Sea of *Rome*, at that present time, and in the present State, and in respect of that doctrin which he there intreats of. For otherwise, had he conceiv'd it necessary for him and all men to conform their judgment in matters of faith, to the judgment of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, how came it to pass that he chose rather to believe the Epistle to the *Hebrews* Canonical, upon the authority of the Eastern Church, than to reject it from the Canon upon the authority of the *Roman?* How comes it to pass that he dissented from the Authority of that Church, touching the Canon of the Old Testament? For if you say, that the Church then consented with S. *Hierome*, I fear you will lose your Fort by maintaining your Out-works; and by avoiding this, run into a greater danger of being forc'd to confess the present *Roman* Church opposite herein to the Ancient. How was it possible, that he should ever believe that *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome*, either was or could have been brought over by *the sollicitation of* Fortunatianus *Bishop of* Aquileia, *and brought after two years banishment to subscribe Heresie?* Which Act of *Liberius*, though some fondly question, being so vain as to expect we should rather believe them that lived but yesterday 1300 years almost after the thing is said to be done, and speaking for themselves in their own *Cause*, rather than the dis-interessed time-fellows, or immediate-Successors of *Liberius* himself: yet, I hope, they

Hierom. de scrip. Eccl. tit. Fortunatianus.

will not proceed to such a degree of immodesty, as once to question, Whether S. *Hierome* thought so. And if this cannot be denyed, I demand then, If he had lived in *Liberius* his time, could he, or would he, have written so to *Liberius*, as he does to *Damasus*? Would he have said to him, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *I know that the Church is built upon this Rock, Whosoever gathereth not with thee, scattereth* Would he then have said, the *Roman* faith and the Catholique were the same: or, that the *Roman* faith received no delusions, no not from an Angel? I suppose, he could not have said so with any coherence to his own belief; and therefore conceive it undeniable that what he said then to *Damasus*, he said it (though perhaps he streined too high) only of *Damasus*, and never conceiv'd that his words would have been extended to all his Predecessors and all his Successors.

24. The same Answer I make to the first place of S. *Ambrose*, *viz.* That no more can be certainly concluded from it, but that the Catholique Bishop and the *Roman* Church were then at unity; so that whosoever agreed with the later could not then but agree with the former. But that this Rule was perpetual, and that no man could ever agree with the Catholique Bishops, but he must agree with the *Roman* Church, this he sayes not, nor gives you any ground to conclude from him. *Athanasius* when he was excommunicated by *Liberius*, agreed very ill with the *Roman* Church; and yet you will not gainsay, but he agreed well enough with the Catholique Bishops. The second, I am uncertain what the sense of it is, and what truth is in it; but most certain, that it makes nothing to your present purpose. For it neither affirms nor imports, that separation from the *Roman* Church is a certain mark of Heresie. For the Rights of Communion (whatsoever it signifies,) might be said to flow from it, if that Church were, by Ecclesiastical Law, the head of all other Churches: But unless it were made so by divine Authority, and that absolutely, Separation from it could not be a mark of Heresie.

(b) It is confessed by *Baronius Anno* 238. *N.* 41. By *Bellar. l* 4. *de R. Pont. c.* 7. *Sect. Tertia ratio.*

(c) Confessed by *Baronius. An* 258. *N.* 14. *&* 15. By *Card. Perron.* Repl. *l.* 1. *c.* 25.

(d) *Ibid.*

25. For S. *Cyprian*; all the world knows that he (b) resolutely opposed a Decree of the *Roman* Bishop, and all that adhered to him in the point of Rebaptizing, which that Church at that time delivered as a necessary Tradition. So necessary, that by the Bishop of *Rome Firmilianus* and other Bishops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia* and *Galatia*, and generally all who persisted in the contrary opinion, (c) were therefore deprived of the Churches Communion, (which Excommunication could not but involve S. *Cyprian*, who defended the same opinion as resolutely as *Firmilianus*, though Cardinal *Perron* magisterially and without all colour of proof affirm the contrary) and *Cyprian* in particular so far cast off, as for it to be pronounc'd by *Stephen*, *A false Christ*. Again, so necessary, that the Bishops which were sent by *Cyprian* from *Africk* to *Rome*, were not admitted to the Communion of ordinary conference: But all men who were subject to the Bishop of *Romes* Authority, were commanded by him not only to deny them the Churches peace and Communion, but even lodging and entertainment: manifestly declaring, that they reckoned them among those whom S. *John* forbids *to receive to house, or to say God speed to them.* All these terrors notwithstanding, S. *Cyprian* holds still his former opinion. And though out of respect to the Churches peace (d) *he judged no man, nor cut off any man from the right of Communion, for thinking otherwise then he held*, yet he conceived *Stephen* and his adherents, (c) to hold a pernitious error. And S. *Austin*, (though disputing with the *Donatists* he useth some Tergiversation in the point,)

(d) *Vide Conc. Carth. apud. Sur. To* 1.

(e) *Bell. l.* 2. *de Con. c.* 5. *Aug. ep.* 48. *& l.* 1. *de Bap. c.* 18.

point,) yet confeſſeth elſewhere, that *it is not found that* Cyprian *did ever change his opinion.* And ſo farr was he from conceiving any neceſſity of doing ſo, by ſubmitting to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*, that he plainly profeſſeth that no other Biſhop, *but our Lord Jeſus only, had power to judg* (with authority) *of his judgement*; and as plainly intimates that *Stephen*, for uſurping ſuch a power, and making himſelf *a judg over Biſhops, was little better than a Tyrant:* and as heavily almoſt he cenſures him, and peremptorily oppoſes him as obſtinate in error, in that very place where he delivers that famous ſaying, *How can he have God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his Mother?* little doubting, it ſeems, but a man might have the Church for his Mother, who ſtood in oppoſition to the Church of *Rome*, and being farr from thinking what you fondly obtrude upon him, that to be united to the *Roman* Church, and to the Church was all one, and that ſeparation from S. *Peter*'s Chair was a mark (I mean, a certain mark) either of Schiſm or Hereſie. If after all this, you will catch at a phraſe or a complement of S. *Cyprians*, and, with that, hope to perſwade Proteſtants, who know this ſtory as well as their own name, that S. *Cyprian* did believe that *falſhood could not have acceſs to the* Roman *Church*, and that oppoſition to it was the brand of an Heretique: may we not well expect, that you will the next time you write, vouch *Luther* and *Calvin* alſo for Abettors of this Phanſie, and make us poor men believe not only (as you ſay) that we have no Metaphyſicks, but that we have no ſenſe? And when you have done ſo, it will be no great difficulty for you, to aſſure us that we read no ſuch thing in *Bellarmine*, as *that* Cyprian *was always accounted in the number of Catholicks*; nor in *Caniſius*, that he was a *moſt excellent Doctor and a glorious Martyr*; nor in your Calender, that he *is a Saint and a Martyr*; but that all theſe are deceptions of our ſight, and that you ever eſteemed him a very Schiſmatique and an Heretique, as having on him the Mark of the Beaſt, *oppoſition to the Chair of* Peter. Nay that he (what ever he pretended, knew & believed himſelf to be ſo; in as much as he knew as you pretend,) and eſteemed this oppoſition to be the Mark of Hereſie, and knew himſelf to ſtand, and ſtand out, in ſuch an oppoſition.

Bell. l. 2. de Con. c. 5. Sect. 1. Caniſius. in Initio Catech. eSpt. die 14.

26. But we need not ſeek ſo farr for matter to refute the vanity of this pretence. Let the reader but peruſe this very Epiſtle out of which this ſentence is alleaged, and he ſhall need no farther ſatisfaction againſt it. For he ſhall find, firſt, that you have helped the dice a little with a falſe, or at leaſt with a very bold and ſtreined, Tranſlation: for S. *Cyprian* ſaith not, *to whom falſehood cannot have acceſs*, by which many of you favourable Readers, I doubt, underſtood, that *Cyprian* had exempted that Church from a poſſibility of error, but to whom *perfidiouſneſs cannot have acceſs*, meaning by perfidiouſneſs in the abſtract, according to a common figure of ſpeech, thoſe perfidious Schiſmatiques whom he there complains of: and of theſe by a Rhetorical inſinuation, he ſays, that *with ſuch good Chriſtians as the* Romans *were, it was not poſſible they ſhould find favourable entertainment.* Not that he conceived it any way impoſſible they ſhould do ſo (for the very writing this Epiſtle, and many paſſages in it, plainly ſhew the contrary;) but becauſe he was confident, or at leaſt would ſeem to be confident, they never would, and ſo by his good opinion and confidence in the *Romans*, lay an obligation upon them, to do as he preſum'd they would do; as alſo in the end of his Epiſtle, he ſays even of the people of the Church of *Rome*, *that being*

defended by the providence of their Bishop, nay, by their own Vigilance sufficiently guarded, they could not be taken nor deceived with the poysons of Heretiques. Not that indeed he thought either this or the former any way impossible: For to what purpose, but for prevention hereof, did he write this long and accurate and vehement Epistle to *Cornelius?* which sure had been most vainly done, to prevent that which he knew or believed impossible! Or how can this consist with his taking notice in the beginning of it, *That* Cornelius *was somewhat moved and wrought upon by the attempts of his Adversaries*, with his reprehending him for being so, and with his vehement exhorting him to courage and constancy, or with his request to him, in the conclusion of his Epistle, that it should *be read publiquely to the whole Clergy and Laity of* Rome, *to the intent, that if any contagion of their poysoned speech and pestiferous semination, had crept in amongst them, it might be wholly taken away from the ears and the hearts of the Brethren: and that the entire and syncere charity of good men might be purged from all dross of heretical detraction:* Or lastly, with his vehement perswasions to them to decline, *for the time to come, and resolutely avoid their word and conference, because their speech crept as a canker*, as the Apostle saith; *because evil communication would corrupt good manners, because wicked men carry perdition in their mouths, and hide fire in their lips?* All which had been but vain and ridiculous pageantry, had he verily believed the *Romans* such inaccessable Forts, such immoveable Rocks, as the former sentences would seem to import, if we will expound them rigidly and strictly, according to the exigence of the words, and not allow him who was a professed Master of the Art, to have used here a little Rhetorique, and to say, *That could not be*, whereof he had no absolute certainty but that it might be, but only had, or would seem to have a great confidence that it never would be, *Ut fides habita fidem obligaret*, that he professing to be confident of the *Romans*, might lay an obligation upon them to do as he promis'd himself they would do. For as for *joyning the principal Church and the Chair of* Peter, how that will serve for your present purpose, of proving separation from the *Roman* Church a mark of Heresie, I suppose it is hard to understand! Nor indeed how it will advantage you in any other design against us, who do not altogether deny, but that the Church of *Rome* might be called the *Chair of Peter*, in regard he is said to have preached the Gospel there; and *the Principal Church*, because the City was the Principal and Imperial City: which *Prerogative of the City*, if we believe the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon*, was the ground and occasion, why the Fathers of former time (I pray observe,) conferred upon this Church, this Prerogative above other Churches.

27. And as farr am I from understanding, how you can collect from the other sentence, that to communicate with the Church and Pope of *Rome*, and to communicate with the Catholique Church, is *alwayes* (for that is your Assumpt) one and the same thing. Saint *Cyprian* speaks not of the Church of *Rome* at all, but of the Bishop only, who when he doth communicate with the Catholique Church, as *Cornelius* at that time did, then whosoever communicates with him, cannot but communicate with the Catholique Church: and then by accident one might truly say, such a one communicates with you, that is, with the Catholique Church, and that to communicate with him is to communicate with the Catholique Church. As if *Titius*

and

and *Sempronius* be together, he that is in company with *Titius*, cannot but be at that time in company with *Sempronius*. As if a General be marching to ſome place with an Army, he that then is with the General muſt at that time be with the Army: And a man may ſay without abſurdity, Such a time I was with the General, that is, with the Army, and that to be with the General is to be with the Army. Or as if a mans hand be joyned to his body, the finger which is joyned to the hand is joyned to the body, and a man may ſay truly of it, This finger is joyned to the hand, that is, to the body, and, to be joyned to the hand is to be joyned to the body; becauſe all theſe things are by accident true. And yet I hope you would not deny, but the finger might poſſibly be joyned to the hand, and yet not to the body, the hand being cut off from the body; and a man might another time, be with his General and not with his Army, he being abſent from the Army. And therefore by like reaſon your collection is ſophiſtical, being in effect but this, to communicate with ſuch a Biſhop of *Rome*, who did communicate with the Catholique Church, was to communicate with the Catholique Church, therefore abſolutely and alwayes it muſt be true, that, To communicate with him, is by conſequent to communicate with the Catholique Church, and to be divided from his Communion, is to be an Heretique.

28. In urging the place of *Irenæus*, you have ſhewed much more ingenuity than many of your Fellows. For whereas they uſually begin at, *Declaring the Tradition of the, &c* and conceal what goes before; you have ſet it down, though not ſo compleatly as you ſhould have done yet ſufficiently to ſhew, that what authority in the matter he attributed to the *Roman* Church in particular, the ſame for the kind (though parhaps not in the ſame degree) he attributed to all other Apoſtolique Churches. Either therefore you muſt ſay, that he conceived the Teſtimony of other Apoſtolique Churches divine and infallible, (which certainly he did not, neither do you pretend he did, and if he had, the confeſſed Errors and Hereſies which after they fell into would demonſtrate plainly that he had erred) or elſe that he conceived the teſtimony of the *Roman* Church only humane and credible, though perhaps more credible than any one Church beſide, (as one man's Teſtimony is more credible than anothers;) but certainly much more credible, which was enough for his purpoſe, than that ſecret Tradition, to which thoſe Heretiques pretended, againſt whom he wrote, over-bearing them with an argument of their own kind, farr ſtronger than their own. Now if *Irenæus* thought the Teſtimony of the *Roman* Church in this point only humane and fallible, then ſurely he could never think, either adhering to it a certain mark of a Catholique, or ſeparation from it a certain mark of an Heretique.

29. Again, whereas your great *Achilles* Cardinal *Perron* in *French*; as alſo his *Noble Tranſlatreſs*, miſled by him, in *Engliſh*, knowing that mens reſorting to *Rome* would do his cauſe little ſervice, hath made bold with the *Latine* tongue, as he does very often with the *Greek*, and rendred *Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, To this Church it is neceſſary that every Church ſhould agree*, you have Tranſlated it, as it ſhould be, *to this Church it is neceſſary that all Churches reſort:* wherein you have ſhewed more ſincerity, and have had more regard to make the Author ſpeak ſenſe. For if he had ſaid, *By ſhewing the Tradition of the* Roman *Church we confound all Heretiques; For, to this Church, all Churches muſt agree*, what had this been, but to give for a reaſon, that which was more queſtionable

than the thing in queſtion: as being neither evident in it ſelf, and plainly denyed by his adverſaries, & not at all proved nor offered to be proved here or elſewhere by *Irenæus*. To ſpeak thus therefore had been weak and ridiculous. But on the other ſide, if we conceive him to ſay thus, *You Heretiques decline a trial of your Doctrin by Scripture, as being corrupted and imperfect, and not fit to determin Controverſies without recourſe to Tradition, and, inſtead hereof, you fly for a refuge to a ſecret Tradition, which you pretend that you received from your Anceſtors, and they from the Apoſtles; certainly, your calumnies againſt Scripture are moſt unjuſt and unreaſonable: but yet moreover, aſſure your ſelves, that if you will be tryed by Tradition, even by that alſo you will be overthrown. For our Tradition is far more famous, more conſtant, and in all reſpects more credible, than that which you pretend to. It were eaſie for me, to muſter up againſt you the uninterrupted ſucceſſions of all the Churches founded by the Apoſtles, all conſpiring in their Teſtimonies againſt you: But becauſe it were too long to number up the Succeſſions of all Churches, I will content my ſelf with the Tradition of the moſt ancient and moſt glorious Church of* Rome, *which alone is ſufficient for the confutation and confuſion of your Doctrin, as being in credit and authority, as farr beyond the Tradition you build upon, as the light of the Sun is beyond the light of a Gloworm. For to this Church, by reaſon it is placed in the Imperial City, whither all mens affairs do neceſſarily draw them, or by reaſon of the powerful principality it hath over all the adjacent Churches, there is, and always hath been, a neceſſity of a perpetual recourſe of all the faithful round about: who if there had been any alteration in the Church of* Rome, *could not in all probability but have obſerved it. But they to the contrary, have always obſerved in this Church the very Tradition which came from the Apoſtles and no other.* I ſay, if we conceive his meaning thus, his words will be intelligible and rational: which if inſtead of *reſort* we put in *agree* will be quite loſt. Herein therefore we have been beholding to your honeſty, which makes me think you did not wittingly falſifie, but only twice in this ſentence miſtake *Undique* for *Ubique*, and tranſlate it, *every where*, and *of what place ſoever*, in ſtead of *round about*. For that it was neceſſary *for all the faithful of what place ſoever to reſort to* Rome, is not true. That *The Apoſtolique Tradition hath alwayes been conſerved there from thoſe who are every where*, is not Senſe. Now inſtead of *conſervata* read *obſervata*, as in all probability it ſhould be, and tranſlate *undique* truly *round about*, and then the ſenſe will be both plain and good; for then it muſt be rendred thus, *For to this Church, by reaſon of a more powerful principality, there is a neceſſity that all the Churches, that is, all the faithful round about, ſhould reſort, in which the Apoſtolique Tradition hath been alwayes obſerved by thoſe who were round about.* If any man ſay, I have been too bold a Critick in ſubſtituting *obſervata* inſtead of *conſervata*, I deſire him to know, that the conjecture is not mine, and therefore as I expect no praiſe for it, ſo, I hope, I ſhall be farr from cenſure. But I would intreat him to conſider, whether it be not likely that the ſame *Greek* word ſignifying *obſervo* and *conſervo*, the Tranſlater of *Irenæus*, who could hardly ſpeak *Latin*, might not eaſily miſtake, and tranſlate διατηρεῖται, *conſervata eſt*, inſtead of *obſervata eſt*; Or, whether it be not likely, that thoſe men which anciently wrote Books, and underſtood them not, might not eaſily commit ſuch an errour; Or, whether the ſenſe of the place can be ſalved any other way; if it can, in God's name let it; if not, I hope,

hope, he is not to be condemned, who with ſuch a little alteration hath made that ſenſe which he found non-ſenſe.

30. But whether you will have it *Obſervata* or *Conſervata*, the new *ſumpſimus* or the old *mumpſimus*, poſſibly it may be ſomething to *Irenæus*, but to us, or our cauſe, it is no way material. For if the reſt be rightly tranſlated, neither will *Conſervata* afford you any argument againſt us, nor *Obſervata* help us to any evaſion. For though at the firſt hearing of the glorious attributes here given, (and that juſtly) to the Church of *Rome*, *The confounding Heretiques with her Tradition, and ſaying, It is neceſſary for all Churches to reſort to her*, may ſound like Arguments for you; yet he that is attentive, I hope, will eaſily diſcover, that it might be good and rational in *Irenæus* having to do with Heretiques, who, ſomewhat like thoſe, who would be the only Catholiques, declined a tryal by Scripture, as not containing the Truth of Chriſt perfectly, and not fit to decide Controverſies, without recourſe to Tradition: I ſay, he will eaſily perceive that it might be rational in *Irenæus* to urge them, with any Trad tion of more credit than their own, eſpecially a Tradition conſonant to Scripture, and even contain'd in it; and yet that it may be irrational in you to urge us, who do not decline Scripture, but appeal to it as a perfect rule of faith, with a Tradition which we pretend is many wayes repugnant to Scripture; and repugnant to a Tradition farr more general than it ſelf, which gives Teſtimony to Scripture; and laſtly, repugnant to it ſelf as giving atteſtation both to Scripture, and to Doctrins plainly contrary to Scripture. Secondly, that the Authority of the *Roman* Church was then a farr greater Argument of the Truth of her Tradition when it was United with all other Apoſtolique Churches, than now when it is divided from them, according to that of *Tertullian, Had the Churches erred they would have varied, but that which is the ſame in all, cannot be Error but Tradition*; and therefore *Irenæus* his Argument may be very probable, yet yours may be worth nothing. Thirdly, that fourteen hundred years may have made a great deal of alteration in the *Roman* Church: as Rivers, though neer the fountain they may retain their native and unmixt ſincerity, yet in long progreſs cannot but take in much mixture that came not from the fountain. And therefore the *Roman* Tradition, though then pure, may now be corrupt and impure: and ſo this Argument (being one of thoſe things which are the worſe for wearing) might in *Irenæus* his time be ſtrong and vigorous, and after declining and decaying may long ſince have fallen to nothing. Eſpecially, conſidering that *Irenæus* playes the Hiſtorian only, and not the Prophet, and ſayes only, that the *Apoſtolique Tradition had been alwayes there as in other Apoſtolique Churches conſerved or obſerved*, chooſe you whether, but that *it ſhould be alwayes ſo*, he ſayes not, neither had he any warrant. He knew well enough that there was foretold a *great falling away* of the Churches of Chriſt to Anti-chriſt: that the *Roman* Church in particular was fore-warned that ſhe alſo, *Nay the whole Church of the Gentiles might fall if they lookt not to their ſtanding*: and therefore to ſecure her that ſhe ſhould ſtand for ever, he had no Reaſon, nor Authority. Fourthly, that it appears manifeſtly out of this Book of *Irenæus* quoted by you, that the doctrin of the Chiliaſts was in his judgement Apoſtolique Tradition, as alſo it was eſteemed (for ought appears to the contrary by all the Doctors, and Saints, and Martyrs of or about his time, for all that ſpeak of it, or whoſe judgements Rom. 11.

in

in the point are any way recorded, are for it: and *Justin Martyr* professeth that *all good and Orthodox Christians of his time believed it*, and those that did not, he reckons amongst Heretiques. Now I demand, was this Tradition one of those that was conserved, and observed in the Church of *Rome*, or was it not? If not, had *Irenæus* known so much, he must have retracted this commendation of that Church. If it was, then the Tradition of the present Church of *Rome* contradicts the Ancient, and accounts it Heretical, and then sure it can be no certain note of Heresie to depart from them, who have departed from themselves, and prove themselves subject unto Errour by holding contradictions. Fifthly and lastly, that out of the Story of the Church it is as manifest as the light at noon, that though *Irenæus* did esteem the *Roman* Tradition a great Argument of the doctrin which he there delivers and defends against the Heretiques of his time, *viz. That there is one God*, yet he was very far from thinking that Church was, and ever should be a safe keeper, and an infallible witness of Tradition in general: Inasmuch as in his own life, his action proclaim'd the contrary. For when *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* obtruded the *Roman* Tradition touching the time of *Easter* upon *Asian* Bishops under the pain of Excommunication, and *damnation*; *Irenæus*, and all the other Western Bishops, though agreeing with him in his observation, yet sharply reprehended him for excommunicating the *Asian* Bishops for their disagreeing, plainly shewing that they esteemed that not a necessary doctrin and a sufficient ground of excommunication, which the Bishop of *Rome* and his adherents did so account of: For otherwise how could they have reprehended him for excommunicating them, had the conceived the cause of this Excommunication just and sufficient? And besides, evidently declaring that they esteemed not separation from the *Roman* Church a certain mark of Heresie, seeing they esteemed not them Heretiques though separated and cut off from the *Roman* Church.

In Dial. cum Typhon.

Cardinal *Perron* to avoid the stroak of this convincing argument, raiseth a cloud of eloquent words, which because you borrow them of him in your Second part, I will here insert, and with short censures dispel; and let his Idolaters see that Truth is not afraid of Giants: His words are these.

Lib. 3. cap. 2. Of his Reply to King James. n. 2. sect. 32.

The first instance then that Calvin *alleageth against the Popes censures, is taken from* Eusebius (*a*) *an Arrian author, and from* Ruffinus (*b*) *enemie to the* Roman *Church his translator; who writ,* (*c*) *that* S. IRENÆUS *reprehended Pope* Victor *for having excommunicated the Churches of* Asia *for the question of the day of Pasche, which they observed according to a particular tradition that* S. JOHN *had introduced* (*d*) *for a time in their Provinces, because of the neighbourhood of the* Jews, *and to bury the Synagogue with honour; and not according to the universal Tradition of the Apostles.* Irenæus (*saith* Calvin) reprehended Pope *Victor* bitterly, because for a light cause he had moved a great and perillous contention in the Church. *There is this in the Text that* Calvin *produceth*, he reprehended him, that he had not done well, to cut off from the body of unity, so many and so great Churches. *But against whom maketh this, but* (*e*) *against those that object it? for who sees not, that* S. IRENÆUS, *doth not there reprehend the Pope for the* (*f*) *want of power, but for the ill use of his power; and doth not reproach to the Pope, that he could not excommunicate the* Asians, *but admonisheth him, that*

Calv ubi supra.

Ruffin. in vers. hist. Eccl Eus. l. 5 c. 24.

that for (g) so small a cause he should not have cut off so many Provinces from the body of the Church? Irenæus (*saith* Eusebius) did fitly exhort Pope *Victor* that he should not cut off all the Churches of God which held this ancient tradition. *And* Ruffinus *translating and envenoming* Eusebius *saith*; He questioned *Victor*, that he had not done well in cutting off from the Body of Unity so many and so great Churches of God. *And in truth, how could* S. IRENÆUS *have reprehended the Pope for want of power*; *he that cites*: To the *Roman* Church, because of a more powerful principality; *(that is to say) as above appeareth, (h) because of a principality more powerful than the temporal: or (as we have expounded otherwhere) because of a more powerful Original:* (*i*) It is necessary that every Church should agree? *And (k) therefore also* S. IRENÆUS *alleageth not to Pope* Victor, *the example of him, and of the other Bishops of the* Gauls *assembled in a Council holden expresly for this effect, who had not excommunicated the* Asians: *nor the example of* Narcissus *Bishop of* Jerusalem, *and of the Bishops of* Palestina *assembled in another Council, holden expresly for the same effect, who had not excommunicated them; nor the example of* Palmas, *and of the other Bishops of* Pontus *assembled in the same manner, and for the same cause in the Region of* Pontus, *who had not excommunicated them*; *but only alleadges to him the example of the Popes his predecessors:* The Prelates (*saith he*) who have presided before *Soter* in the Church where thou presidest, *Anisius, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus*, and *Sixtus*, have not observed this custom, *&c.* and nevertheless none of those that observed it, have been excommunicated. *And yet, O admirable providence of God, the (l) success of the after-ages shewed, that even in the use of his power, the Popes proceeding was just. For after the death of* Victor, *the Councils of* Nicea, *of* Constantinople, *and of* Ephesus, *excommunicated again those that held the same custom with the Provinces, that the Pope had excommunicated, and placed them in the Catalogue of Heretiques, under the titles of heretiques* Quarto-decumans.

Euseb hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24.

Ruffin. ib. c. 24. Iren l. 3. c. 3. 1. Book. Ch. 25.

Euseb. hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 22.

Iren. apud Euseb. hist. Eccl. 5. c. 26.

Conc. Antioch. c. 1. Conc. Const. c. 7. Conc. Eph. p. 2. act. 6.

But to this instance Calvins *Sect do annex two new Observations*; *the first, that the Pope having threatned the Bishops of* Asia *to excommunicate them,* Polycrates *the Bishop of* Ephesus *and Metropolitan of* Asia, *despised the Popes threats, as it appears by the answer of the same* Polycrates *to Pope* Victor, *which is inserted in the writings of* Eusebius, *and of* Saint JEROM, *and which* JEROM *seemeth to approve, when he saith, he reports it* to shew the spirit and authority of the man. *And the second, that when the Pope pronounced anciently his Excommunications, he did no other thing but separate himself from the Communion of those that he excommunicated, and did not thereby separate them from the universal communion of the Church. To the first then we say, that so farr is this Epistle of* Polycrates *from abating and diminishing the Popes authority, that contrariwise it greatly magnifies and exalts it. For although* Polycrates *blinded with the love of the custom of his Nation, which he believed to be grounded upon the Word of God, who had assigned the fourteenth of the Moneth of* March, *for the observation of the* Pasche, *and upon the example of* S. JOHN'S *tradition maintains it obstinately*; *Nevertheless, this that he answers, speaking in his own Name, and in the name of the Council of the Bishops of* Asia, *to whom he presided*; I fear not those that threeaten us; for my Elders have said, It is better to obey God than man: *Doth it not shew, that had it not been, that he believed the Pope's threat, was against the expres Word of God, there had been cause*

Euseb. hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24. Hieron. in Hieron. in script. Eccl. in Polycr.

Exod. 12.

Hieronym. ubi supra.

to

to fear it, and he had been obliged to obey him; for (m) who knows not, that this anſwer, It is better to obey God than men, *is not to be made but to thoſe whom we were obliged to obey, if their commandements were not contrary to the commandements of God; And that he adds, that he had called the Biſhops of* Aſia, *to a National Council, being (n) ſummoned to it by the Pope; doth it not inſinuate, that the other Councils whereof* Euſebius *ſpeaks, that were holden about this matter, through all the Provinces of the Earth, and particularly that of* Paleſtina, *which if you believe the act that* Beda *ſaid came to his hands,* Theophilus *Archbiſhop of* Ceſarea *had called by the auctority of* Victor, *were holden at the inſtance of the Pope, and conſequently, that the Pope was the firſt mover of the Univerſal Church? And that the Councils of* Nicea, *of* Conſtantinople, *of* Epheſus, *embraced the Cenſure of* Victor, *and excommunicated thoſe that obſerved the cuſtom of* Polycrates *that was deceived, in believing that the Popes commandement, was againſt Gods commandement? And that S.* JEROM *himſelf celebrates the Paſchal Homilies of* Theophilus *Patriarch of* Alexandria, *which followed the Order of* Nicea *concerning the* Paſche; *doth it not juſtifie, that when S.* JEROM *ſaith, That he reports the Epiſtle of* Polycrates, to ſhew the ſpirit, and authority of the man, *he intends by authority, not authority of right, but of fact; that is to ſay, the credit that* Polycrates *had amongſt the* Aſians, *and other* Quarto decimans?

Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 23.

Beda in frag. de Æquinoctio vernali.

Theſe are the Cardinal's words, the moſt material and conſiderable paſſages whereof to ſave the trouble of repetition, I have noted with letters of reference: whereunto my anſwers noted reſpectively with the ſame letters, follow now in order.

(a) If *Euſebius* were an *Arrian* author, it is nothing to the purpoſe; what he writes there is no *Arrianiſm*, nor any thing towards it. Never any error was imputed to the *Arrians* for denying the Authority or the infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*. Beſides, what *Euſebius* ſays, he ſays out of *Irenæus*: Neither doth, or can the Cardinal deny the ſtory to be true, and therefore he goes about by indirect Arts to foil it, and caſt a blurr upon it. Laſtly, whenſoever *Euſebius* ſays any thing, which the Cardinal thinks for the advantage of his ſide, he cites him, and then he is no *Arrian*: or at leaſt he would not take that for an anſwer to the arguments he draws out of him.

(b) That *Ruffinus* was enemy to the *Roman* Church, is ſaid, but not proved, neither can it be.

(c) *Euſebius* ſays the ſame alſo of *cæteri omnes Epiſcopi*, all the other Biſhops, That they adviſed *Victor* to keep thoſe things, that belonged to peace and unity, and that they ſharply reprehended *Victor*, for having done otherwiſe.

(d) This is ſaid, but no offer made of any proof of it: The Cardinal thinks we muſt take every thing upon his word. They to whom the Tradition was delivered, *Polycrates* and the *Aſian* Biſhops, knew no ſuch matter, nay, profeſſed the contrary. And who is more likely to know the Truth, they which lived within two ages of the fountain of it, or the Cardinal who lived ſixteen ages after it?

(e) How can it make againſt thoſe that object it: ſeeing it is evident from *Irenæus* his Reprehenſion, that he thought *Victor* and the *Roman* Church, no infallible nor ſufficient Judge, of what was neceſſary to be believed and done, what not: what was univerſal Tradition, what not:

what

what was a ſufficient ground of Excommunication, and what not: and conſequently, that there was no ſuch neceſſity as is pretended, that all other Churches ſhould, in matters of faith, conform themſelves to the Church of *Rome?*

(f) This is to ſuppoſe, that Excommunication is an Act, or Argument, or ſign of Power and Authority in the party excommunicating, over the party excommunicated; whereas it is undeniably evident out of the Church-Story, that it was often uſed by Equals upon Equals, and by Inferiours upon Superiours, if the Equals or Inferiours, thought their Equals or Superiours did any thing which deſerved it.

(g) And what is this but to confeſs, that they thought that a ſmall cauſe of Excommunication and unſufficient, which *Victor* and his adherents thought great and ſufficient? And conſequently, that *Victor* and his Part declared that to be a matter of faith and of neceſſity, which they thought not ſo; And where was then their conformity?

(h) True, you have ſo expounded it, but not proved nor offered any proof of your exception. This alſo we muſt take upon your Authority. *Irenæus* ſpeaks not one Word of any other power, to which he compares, or before which he preferrs, the power of the *Roman*-Church. And it is evident out of the Council of *Chalcedon*; * That *all the Principality which it had, was given* it (not by God, but) *by the Church, in regard it was ſeated in the Imperial City.* Whereupon, when afterwards *Conſtantinople* was the Imperial City, they decreed that *that Church ſhould have equal Priviledges and dignity and preheminence with the Church of* Rome. All the Fathers agreed in this Decree, ſaving only the Legats of the Biſhop of *Rome:* ſhewing plainly, that they never thought of any Supremacy given the Biſhops of *Rome* by God, or grounded upon Scripture; but only by the Church, and therefore alterable at the Churches pleaſure. * Cant. 28.

(i) This is falſely tranſlated. *Convenire ad Romanam Eccleſiam*, every body knows, ſignifies no more but to reſort or come to the *Roman* Church: which then there was a neceſſity that men ſhould do, becauſe that the affairs of the Empire were tranſacted in that place. But yet *Irenæus* ſayes not ſo of every Church ſimply, which had not been true, but only of the Adjacent Churches: for ſo he expounds himſelf in ſaying, *To this Church it is neceſſary that every Church*, that is, all the faithful, *round about ſhould reſort.* With much more reaſon therefore we return the Argument thus. Had *Irenæus* thought that all Churches muſt of neceſſity agree with the *Roman*, how could he and all other Biſhops have then pronounc'd, that to be no matter of Faith, no ſufficient ground of Excommunication, which *Victor* & his adherents thought to be ſo? And how then could they have reprehended *Victor* ſo much, for the ill uſe of his power, as Cardinal *Perron* confeſſes they did; ſeeing, if that was true which is pretended, in this alſo as well as other things, it was neceſſary for them to agree with the Church of *Rome?*

Some there are that ſay, but more wittily than truly, that all Cardinal *Bellarmines* works, are ſo conſonant to themſelves, as if he had written them in two hours. Had Cardinal *Perron* wrote his Book in two hours, ſure he would not have done that here in the middle of the Book, which he condemns in the beginning of it. For here he urgeth a Conſequence, drawn from the miſtaken words of *Irenæus* againſt his lively and actual practice: which Proceeding, there he juſtly condemns of evident injuſtice. His words

words are *, *For who knows not that it is too great an injuſtice to alleage conſequences from paſſages, and even thoſe ill interpreted and miſunderſtood, and in whoſe Illation there is always ſome Paralogiſm hid againſt the expreſs words, and the lively and actual practiſe of the ſame Fathers from whom they are collected: and that it may be good, to take the Fathers for Adverſaries, and to accuſe them for want of ſenſe or memory: but not to take them for Judges, and to ſubmit themſelves to the obſervation of what they have believ'd and practiſed.*

* In his Letter to *Caſaubon*, towards the end.

(k) This is nothing to the purpoſe: he might chooſe theſe examples, not as of greater force and authority in themſelves, but as fitter to be imployed againſt *Victor*, as domeſtique examples are fitter and more effectual than forrain: and for his omitting to preſs him with his own example and others, to what purpoſe had it been to uſe them, ſeeing their Letters ſent to *Victor* from all parts, wherein they reprehend his preſumption, ſhewed him ſufficiently, that their example was againſt him. But beſides, he that reads *Irenæus* his Letter, ſhall ſee, that in the matter of the Lent-Faſt, and the great variety about the celebration of it, which he parallels with this of Eaſter, he preſſeth *Victor* with the example of himſelf and others, not Biſhops of *Rome*; *Both they* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of other Biſhops), *notwithſtanding this difference, retained peace among themſelves*; and *we alſo among our ſelves retain it*; inferring from his example, that *Victor* alſo ought to do ſo.

(l) If the Pope's proceeding was juſt, then the Churches of *Aſia* were indeed, and in the ſight of God excommunicate, and out of the ſtate of Salvation: which *Irenæus*, and all the other ancient Biſhops never thought. And if they were ſo, why do you account them Saints and Martyrs? But the truth is, that theſe Councels did no way ſhew the Pope's proceedings juſt, but rather the contrary. For though they ſetled an uniformity in this matter, yet they ſetled it as a matter formerly indifferent, and not as a matter of faith or neceſſity, as it is evident out of * *Athanaſius*; and conſequently, they rather declare *Victor*'s proceeding unjuſt, who excommunicated ſo many Churches, for differing from him in an indifferent matter.

* *In ep. ad Epiſcopos in Africa*: Where he clearly ſhews that this queſtion was not a queſtion of faith, by ſaying, *The Council of* Nice *was celebrated, by occaſion of the* Arrian Hereſie *and the difference about Eaſter. In ſo much as* they in Syria *and* Cilicia *and* Meſopotamia, *did differ herein from* us, *and kept* this Feaſt *on the ſame* day with the *Jews*: But thanks *be to* God, an agreement was made, as concerning the Faith, ſo alſo concerning this holy Feaſt.

(m) It ſeems then *Polycrates* might be a Saint and a Martyr, and yet think the commands of the *Roman* Church, enjoyned upon pain of damnation, contrary to the commandements of God. Beſides, S. *Peter* himſelf, the head of the Church, the Vicar of Chriſt (as you pretend), made this very anſwer to the high Prieſt; yet I hope, you will not ſay, he was his inferior and obliged to obey him. Laſtly, who ſees not, that when the Pope commands us any thing unjuſt, as to communicate Lay-men in one kind, to uſe the *Latin* Service, *&c.* we may very fitly ſay to him, *It is better to obey God than men*, and yet never think of any authority he hath over us?

(n) Between requeſting and ſummoning, me-thinks, there ſhould be ſome difference; and *Polycrates* ſays no more, but *he was requeſted by the Church of Rome* to call them, and did ſo. Here then (as very often) the Cardinal is fain to help the dice with a falſe tranſlation; and, his pretence being falſe, every one muſt ſee that that which he pretends to be inſinuated by it, is clearly inconſequent.

(o) *Polycrates* was deceived, if he believed it to be againſt Gods Commandement, and the Pope deceived as much, in thinking it to be Gods commandement, for it was neither one nor the other, but an indifferent matter, wherein God had not interpoſed his Authority. Neither did the Council

Councel of Nice embrace the Censure of *Victor*, by acknowledging his Excommunication to be just and well grounded, for which the Cardinal neither doth pretend, nor can produce any proof, any way comparable to the fore-alledged words of *Athanasius* testifying the contrary; though perventure, having setled the observation, and reduced it to an uniformity, they might excommunicate those who afterward should trouble the Churches peace for an indifferent matter. And thus much for *Irenæus*.

31 I come now to S. *Austin*, and to the first place out of him, where he *seems to say, that the Succession in the Sea of* Peter, *was the Rock which our Saviour meant when he said, Upon this Rock*, &c. I answer, first, we have no reason to be confident of the truth hereof, because S. *Austin* himself was not, but retracts it as uncertain, and *leaves to the Reader whether he will think that, or another more probable. Retr. l.* 1. *c.* 26. Secondly, What he says of the Succession in the Roman Church in this place, he says it elsewhere, of all the Successions in all other Apostolique Churches. Thirdly, that as in this place he urgeth the Donatists with separation from the Roman Church, an Argument of their Errour: So, elsewhere he presseth them with their Separation from other Apostolique Churches, nay more from these than from that, because in *Rome* the Donatists had a Bishop though not a perpetual Succession of them; but in other Apostolique Churches they wanted both. *These scatter'd men* (saith he of the Donatists *Epist.* 165.) *read in the holy books the Churches to which the Apostles wrote, and have no Bishop in them: But what is more perverse and mad, than to the Lectors reading these Epistles to say, Peace with you, and to separate from the peace of these Churches, to which these Epistles were written?* So *Optatus*, having done you (as it might seem, great service) in upbraiding the Donatists as Schismatiques, because they had not Communion with the Church of *Rome*, overthrows and undoes it all again, and as it were with a spunge wipes out all that he hath said for you, by adding after that they were Schismatiques, because *They had not the fellowship of Communion with the seven Churches of Asia, to which S.* John *writes*: whereof he pronounces confidently, (though I know not upon what ground) *Extra septem Ecclesias quicquid foris est, alienum est*. Now, I pray tell me, do you esteem the Authority of these Fathers a sufficient assurance, that separation from these other Apostolique Churches, was a certain mark of Heresie, or not? If so, then your Church hath been for many Ages heretical. If not, How is their authority, a greater Argument for the Roman, than for the other Churches? If you say, they conceived separation from these Churches a note of Schism, only when they were united to the Roman: so also they might conceive of the Roman, only when it was united to them. If you say, they urg'd this only as a probable, and not as a certain Argument, so also they might do that. In a word, whatsoever answer you can devise to shew, that these Fathers made not separation from these other Churches a mark of Heresie, apply that to your own Argument, and it will be satisfied.

32 The other place is evidently impertinent to the present question, nor is there it in any thing but this, That *Cæcilian might contemn the multitude of his adversaries, because those that were united with him were more, and of more account than those that were against him*. Had he preferr'd the Roman Church alone, before *Cæcilian*'s enemies, this had been little, but some-

thing; but when other Countries from which the Gospel came first into *Africa*, are joyned in this Patent, with the Church of *Rome*, how she can build any singular priviledge upon it I am yet to learn! Neither do I see what can be concluded from it, but that *in the Roman Church was the Principality of an* (a) *Apostolique Sea*, which no man doubts: or that the Roman Church, was not the Mother-Church, because the Gospel came first into Africa, not from her, but from other Churches.

(a) You do ill to translate it *the Principality of the Sea Apostolique*, as if there were but one; whereas Saint *Austin* presently after speaks of Apostolical Churches, in the plural number; and makes the Bishops of them joynt-Commissioners for the judging of Ecclesiastical causes.

33. Thus you see his words make very little, or indeed nothing for you. But now his Action, which according to Cardinal *Perron*'s rule, is much more to be regarded than his words, as not being so obnoxious to misinterpretation, I mean his famous opposition of three Bishops of *Rome* in Succession, touching the great question of Appeals, wherein he and the rest of the African Bishops proceeded so far in the first or second *Milevitan* Councel, as to (b) *decree any African Excommunicate, that should appeal to any man out of Africk*, and therein continued resolute unto death: I say this famous Action of his, makes clearly, and evidently, and infinitely against you. For, had *Boniface*, and the rest of the African Bishops, a great part whereof were Saints and Martyrs believed as an Article of faith, that Union and Conformity with the doctrin of the Roman Church, in all things which she held necessary, was a certain note of a good Catholique, and by God's Command necessary to Salvation, how was it possible they should have opposed it in this? Unless you will say they were all so fooliish as to believe at once direct contradictions, *viz.* that conformity to the Roman Church was necessary in all points, and not necessary in this: or so horribly impious, as believing this doctrin of the Roman Church true, and her power to receive Appeals derived from divine Authority, notwithstanding to oppose and condemn it, and to Anathematize all those Africans, of what condition soever, that should appeal unto it. I say, *of what condition soever*: For it is evident, that they concluded in their determination, Bishops as well as the inferiour Clergy and Laity: And Cardinal *Perron*'s pretence of the contrary, is a shameless falshood, repugnant to the plain words of the (c) Remonstrance of the African Bishops to *Celestine* Bishop of *Rome*.

(b) The words of the Decree (which also *Bellarm l. 1. de Matrim. c. 17.* assures us to be perform'd by S. *Austin*) are these. *Si qui (Africani) ab Episcopis provocandum putaverint, non nisi ad Africana provocent. Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit apellandum, à nullo intra Africam in Communionem suscipiatur.* This decree is by *Gratian* most impudently corrupted. For whereas the Fathers of that Councel intended it particularly against the *Church of Rome*, he tels us they forbad Appeals to All, *excepting only the Church of Rome.* (c) The words are these. *Præfato debito salutationis officio, impendiò deprecamur; ut deinceps ad aures vestras hinc venientes, non facilius admittatis; nec à nobis excommunicatos ultra in Communionem velitis recipere, quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile advertet venerabilitas tua. Nam si de inferioribus Clericis vel Laicis videtur id præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de Episcopis voluit observari.*

34 Your allegation of *Tertullian* is a manifest conviction of your want of sincerity: For you produce with great ostentation what he saies of the Church of *Rome*: but you and your fellows always conceal and dissemble, that immediatly before these words he attributes as much for point of direction to any other Apostolique Church, and that as he sends them to *Rome* who lived neer *Italy*, so those neer *Achaia* he sends to *Corinth*, those about *Macedonia to Philippi* and *Thessalonica*, those of *Asia to Ephesus*. His words are, *Go to now thou that wilt better imploy thy curiosity in the business of thy salvation, run over the Apostolical Churches, wherein the Chairs of the Apostles are yet sate upon in their places, wherein the Authentique Epistles*

are

are recited, ſounding out the voice, and repreſenting the face of every one! Is Achaia near thee? there thou haſt Corinth: If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou haſt Philippi, thou haſt Theſſalonica: If thou canſt go into Aſia, there thou haſt Epheſus: If thou be adjacent to Italy, thou haſt Rome, whoſe Authority is neer at hand to us (in *Africk:*) *A happy Church, into which the Apoſtles powred forth all their Doctrin together with their blood*, &c. Now I pray you Sir tell me, if you can for bluſhing, why this place might not have been urg'd by a Corinthian, or Philippian, or Theſſalonian, or an Epheſian, to ſhew that in the judgment of *Tertullian*, ſeparation from any of their Churches is a certain mark of Hereſie, as juſtly and rationally as you alledge it to vindicate this priviledge to the Roman Church only? Certainly, if you will ſtand to *Tertullian*'s judgment, you muſt either grant the authority of the Roman Church (though at that time a good Topical Argument, and perhaps a better than any the Heretiques had, eſpecially in conjunction with other Apoſtolique Churches:) yet, I ſay, you muſt grant it perforce but a fallible Guide as well as that of *Epheſus*, and *Theſſalonica*, and *Philippi*, and *Corinth*: or you muſt maintain the Authority of every one of theſe infallible, as well as the Roman. For though he make a Panegyrick of the Roman Church in particular, and of the reſt only in general, yet, as I have ſaid, for point of direction he makes them all equal, and therefore makes them (chuſe you whether) either all fallible, or all infallible: Now you will and muſt acknowledge that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Churches of *Epheſus*, or *Corinth*: or, if he did, that (as experience ſhews) he erred in doing ſo; and what can hinder, but then we may ſay alſo that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Roman Church, or, if he did, that he erred in doing ſo?

35 From the ſaying of S. *Baſil*, certainly nothing can be gathered, but only *that the Biſhop of Rome may diſcern between that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawful and pure, and without any diminution may preach the faith of our Anceſtors*. Which certainly he might do, if ambition and covetouſneſs did not hinder him, or elſe I ſhould never condemn him for doing otherwiſe. But is there no difference between *may* and *muſt*? Between he may do ſo, and he cannot but do ſo? Or doth it follow, becauſe he may do ſo, therefore he always ſhall or will do ſo? In my opinion rather the contrary ſhould follow! For he that ſaith, you may do thus, implies according to the ordinary ſenſe of words, that if he will he may do otherwiſe. You certainly may, if you pleaſe, leave abuſing the world with ſuch Sophiſtry as this; but whether you will or no, of that I have no aſſurance.

36 Your next Witneſs I would willingly have examined, but it ſeems you are unwilling he ſhould be found, otherwiſe you would have given us your direction where we might have him. Of that *Maximianus* who ſucceeded *Neſtorius*, I can find no ſuch thing in the Councels: Neither can I believe that any Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* twelve hundred years ago was ſo baſe a paraſite of the Sea of *Rome*.

37 Your laſt Witneſs *John* of *Conſtantinople*, I confeſs, ſpeaks home, and advanceth the Roman Sea, even to heaven: But I fear it is, that his own may go up with it, which he there profeſſes to be all one ſea with the ſea of *Rome*; and therefore his Teſtimony, as ſpeaking in his own caſe, is not much to be regarded. But beſides, I have little reaſon to be confident that this Epiſtle is not a forgery; for certainly, *Binius* hath obtruded upon us

many a hundred ſuch. This though written by a Grecian is not extant in Greek but in Latin only. Laſtly it comes out of a ſupicious place, an old book of the *Vatican Library*: which Library the world knows to have been the Mint of very many Impoſtures.

38 *Ad §.* 20,21,22,23. The ſum of your diſcourſe in the four next Sections, if it be pertinent to the Queſtion, in agitation muſt be this: *Want of ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors, holding always the ſame doctrin, and of the forms of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts which are in uſe in the Roman Church, is a certain mark of Hereſie: but Proteſtants want all theſe things: Therefore they are Heretiques.* To which I anſwer, that nothing but want of truth and holding error can make or prove any man or Church heretical. For if he be a true Ariſtotelian, or Platoniſt, or Pyrrhonian, or Epicurean, who holds the doctrin of *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*, or *Pirrho*, or *Epicurus*, although he cannot aſſign any that held it before him for many ages together; why ſhould I not be made a true and orthodox Chriſtian, by believing all the doctrin of Chriſt, though I cannot derive my deſcent from a perpetual Succeſſion that believ'd it before me? By this reaſon you ſhould ſay as well, that no man can be a good Biſhop or Paſtor, or King or Magiſtrate, or Father, that ſucceeds a bad one. For, if I may conform my will and actions to the Commandments of God, why may I not embrace his doctrin with my underſtanding, although my predeceſſor do not ſo? You have above in this Chapter defin'd *Faith, A free Infallible, obſcure, ſupernatural aſſent to divine Truths, becauſe they are revealed by God and ſufficiently propounded*: This definition is very phantaſtical; but for the preſent I will let it paſs, and deſire you to give me ſome piece or ſhadow of reaſon, why I may not do all this without a perpetual Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors that have done ſo before me? You may judge as uncharitably, and ſpeak as malitiouſly of me, as your blind zeal to your Superſtition ſhall direct you, but certainly I know, (and with all your Sophiſtry you cannot make me doubt of what I know,) that I do believe the Goſpel of Chriſt (as it is delivered in the undoubted books of Canonical Scripture,) as verily as that it is now day, that I ſee the light, that I am now writing: and I believe it upon this Motive, becauſe I conceive it ſufficiently, abundantly, ſuperabundantly proved to be divine Revelation: and yet in this, I do not depend upon any Succeſſion of men that have alwayes believed it without any mixture of Errour; nay I am fully perſwaded, there hath been no ſucceſſion, and yet do not find my ſelf any way weakned in my faith by the want of it, but ſo fully aſſured of the truth of it, that not only though your Divels at *Lowden* do tricks againſt it, but though an Angel from heaven ſhould gainſay it or any part of it, I perſwade my ſelf that I ſhould not be moved. This I ſay, and this I am ſure is true: and if you will be ſo hyperſceptical as to perſwade me, that I am not ſure that I do believe all this, I deſire you to tell me, how are you ſure that you believe the Church of *Rome*? For, if a man may perſwade himſelf he doth believe what he doth not believe, then may you think you believe the Church of *Rome*, and yet not believe it. But if no man can err concerning what he believes, then you muſt give me leave to aſſure my ſelf that I do believe, and conſequently, that any man may believe the foreſaid truths upon the foreſaid motives, without any dependance upon any ſucceſſion that hath believed it always. And as from your definition of Faith, ſo from your definition of Hereſie, this ſophancy may be

refuted.

refuted. For questionless no man can be an Heretique but he that holds an Heresie, and an Heresie you say *is a Voluntary error*; therefore no man can be necessitated to be an Heretique whether he will or no, by want of such a thing that is not in his power to have: But that there should have been a perpetual Succession of Believers in all points Orthodox, is not a thing which is in our own power, therefore our being or not being Heretiques depends not on it. Besides, What is more certain, than that he may make a straight line who hath a Rule to make it by, though never man in the world had made any before: and why then may not he that believes the Scripture to be the word of God, and the Rule of faith, regulate his faith by it, and consequently believe aright, without much regarding what other men will do or have done? It is true indeed there is a necessity that if God will have his word believed, he by his Providence must take order, that, either by succession of men, or by some other means natural or supernatural, it be preserv'd and delivered, and sufficiently notified to be his word; but that this should be done by a Succession of men that holds no error against it, certainly there is no more necessity, than that it should be done by a Succession of men that commit no sin against it. For if men may preserve the Records of a Law, and yet transgress it, certainly they may also preserve directions for their faith, and yet not follow them. I doubt not but Lawyers at the Bar do find by frequent experience, that many men preserve and produce evidences, which being examined oftimes make against themselves. This they do ignorantly, it being in their power to suppress, or perhaps to alter them. And why then should any man conceive it strange, that an erroneous and corrupted Church should preserve and deliver the Scriptures uncorrupted, when indeed for many reasons which I have formerly alledged, it was impossible for them to corrupt them? Seeing therefore this is all the necessity that is pretended of a perpetual Succession of men orthodox in all points, certainly there is no necessity at all of any such, neither can the want of it prove any man or any Church Heretical.

39 When therefore you have produced some proof of this, which was your Major in your former Syllogism, That want of Succession is a certain mark of Heresie, you shall then receive a full answer to your Minor. We shall then consider whether your indelible Character be any reality, or whether it be a creature of your own making, a fancy of your own imagination? And if it be a thing, and not only a word, whether our Bishops and Priests have it not as well as yours; and whether some mens perswasion that there is no such thing, can hinder them from having it, or prove that they have it not if there be any such thing! (Any more than a mans perswasion that he has not taken Physick or Poyson, will make him not to have taken it if he has, or hinder the operation of it?) And whether *Tertullian* in the place quoted by you, speak of a Priest made a Layman, by just deposition or degradation, and not by a voluntary desertion of his Order? And whether in the same place he set not some mark upon Heretiques that will agree to your Church? Whether all the Authority of our Bishops in *England* before the Reformation was conferr'd on them by the Pope? And if it were, whether it were the Pope's right, or an usurpation? If it were his right, Whether by Divine Law or Ecclesiastical? And, if by Ecclesiastical only, Whether he might possibly so abuse his power, as to deserve to lose it? Whether *de facto* he had done so? Whether, supposing he had deserved to lose it,

those that deprived him of it, had power to take it from him? Or if not, Whether they had power to suspend him from the use of it, until good caution were put in, and good assurance given, that, if he had it again, he would not abuse it as he had formerly done? Whether in case, they had done unlawfully that took his power from him, it may not (things being now setled, and the present Government established) be as unlawful to go about to restore it? Whether it be not a Fallacy to conclude, Because we believe the Pope hath no power in *England*, now when the King and State and Church hath deprived him upon just grounds of it, therefore we cannot believe that he had any before his deprivation? Whether, without Schism, a man may not withdraw obedience from an usurp'd Authority commanding unlawful things? Whether the Roman Church might not give authority to Bishops and Priests to oppose her errors, as well as a King gives Authority to a Judge to judge against him, if his cause be bad; as well as *Trajan* gave his sword to his Præfect with this Commission, that, *If he governed well, he should use it for him; if ill, against him.* Whether the Roman Church gave not Authority to her Bishops and Priests to preach against her corruptions in manners? And if so, Why not against her errors in doctrin, if she had any? Whether she gave them not authority to preach the whole Gospel of Christ, and consequently against her doctrin, if it should contradict any part of the Gospel of Christ? Whether it be not acknowledged lawful in the Church of *Rome*, for any Lay-man or woman, that has ability, to perswade others by word or by writing from errour, and unto truth? And why this liberty may not be practised against their Religion, if it be false; as well as for it, if it be true? Whether any man need any other commission or vocation than that of a Christian, to do a work of charity? And whether it be not one of the greatest works of charity (if it be done after a peaceable manner, and without any unnecessary disturbance of order) to perswade men out a false, unto a true way of eternal happiness? Especially, the Apostle having assur'd us, that he (whosoever he is) *who converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins?* Whether the first Reformed Bishops died all at once, so that there were not enough to ordain Others in the places that were vacant? Whether the Bishops of *England* may not consecrate a Metropolitan of *England*, as well as the Cardinals do the Pope? Whether the King or Queen of *England*, or they that have the government in their hands, in the minority of the Prince, may not lawfully commend one to them to be consecrated, against whom there is no Canonical exception? Whether the Doctrin, that the King is Supreme Head of the Church of *England*, (as the Kings of *Judah*, and the first Christian Emperours were of the Jewish and Christian Church) be any new-found doctrin? Whether it may not be true, that Bishops being made Bishops, have their authority immediatly from Christ, though this or that man be not made Bishop without the King's authority; as well as you say, the Pope being Pope, has authority immediately from Christ, and yet this or that man cannot be made Pope without the authority of the Cardinals? Whether you do well to suppose, that Christian Kings have no more authority in ordering the affairs of the Church, than the great Turk, or the Pagan Emperors? Whether the King may not give authority to a Bishop to exercise his function in some part of his Kingdom,

and

and yet not be capable of doing it himself: as well as a Bishop may give authority to a Physician, to practise Physick in his Diocess, which the Bishop cannot do himself? Whether, if *Nero* the Emperour would have commanded S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* to preach the Gospel of Christ, and to exercise the office of a Bishop of *Rome*, whether they would have question'd his Authority to do so? Whether there were any Law of God or man, that prohibited King *JAMES* to give Commission to Bishops, nay to lay his Injunction upon them, to do any thing that is lawful? Whether a casual irregularity may not be lawfully dispens'd with? Whether the Pope's irregularities, if he should chance to incur any, be indispensable? And if not, who is he, or who are they, whom the Pope is so subject unto, that they may dispense with him? Whether that be certain which you take for granted; *That your Ordination imprints a character, and ours doth not?* Whether the power of consecrating and ordaining by imposition of hands, may not reside in the Bishops, and be derived unto them, not from the King but God; and yet the King have authority to command them to apply this power to such a fit person, whom he shall commend unto them: As well as if some Architects only had the faculty of architecture, and had it immediatly by infusion from God himself, yet, if they were the King's subjects, he wants not authority to command them to build him a Palace for his use, or a Fortress for his service: Or as the King of *France* pretends not to have power to make Priests himself, yet, I hope, you will not deny him power to command any of his subjects that has this power, to ordain any fit person Priest, whom he shall desire to be ordained? Whether it do not follow, that whensoever the King commands an house to be built, a message to be delivered, or a murtherer to be executed, that all these things are presently done without intervention of the Architect, messenger, or executioner: As well as, that they are *ipso facto* ordain'd and consecrated, who by the King's authority are commended to the Bishops to be ordained and consecrated: Especially, seeing the King will not deny, but that these Bishops may refuse to do what he requires to be done, lawfully if the person be unworthy; if worthy, unlawfully indeed, but yet *de facto* they may refuse: and, in case they should do so, whether justly or unjustly; neither the King himself, nor any body else, would esteem the person Bishop upon the King's designation? Whether many Popes, though they were not consecrated Bishops by any temporal Prince, yet might not, or did not receive authority from the Emperor to exercise their Episcopal function in this or that place? And whether the Emperours had not authority, upon their desert, to deprive them of their jurisdiction, by imprisonment or banishment? Whether Protestants do indeed pretend that their Reformation is universal? Whether in saying, the *Donatists Sect was confined to* Africa, you do not forget your self, and contradict what you said above, in §. 17. of this Chapter, where you tell us, *they had some of their Sect residing in* Rome? Whether it be certain, that none can admit of Bishops willingly, but those that hold them of divine institution? Whether they may not be willing to have them, conceiving that way of government the best, though not absolutely necessary? Whether all those Protestants that conceive the distinction between Priests and Bishops not to be of divine institution, be Schismatical and Heretical for thinking so? Whether your form of ordaining Bishops and Priests, be essential to the constitution of a true Church? Whether

ther the forms of the Church of *England* differ essentially from your forms? Whether in saying, that *the true Church cannot subsist without undoubted true Bishops and Priests*, you have not overthrown the truth of your own Church; wherein I have proved it plainly impossible, that any man should be so much as morally certain, either of his own Priesthood or any other mans? Lastly, Whether any one kind of these external forms and orders, and government, be so necessary to the being of a Church, but that they may be diverse in diverse places, and that a good and peaceable Christian may and ought to submit himself to the Government of the place where he lives, whatsoever it be? All these questions will be necessary to be discussed for the clearing of the truth of the *Minor* proposition of your former Syllogism, and your proofs of it: and I will promise to debate them fairly with you, if first you will bring some better proof of the *Major*, *That want of Succession is a certain note of Heresie*, which for the present remains both unprov'd and unprobable.

40 *Ad* §. 23. *The Fathers*, you say, *assign Succession as one mark of the true Church*: I confess, they did urge Tradition as an Argument of the truth of their doctrin and of the falshood of the contrary; and thus far they agree with you. But now see the difference: They urg'd it not against all Heretiques that ever should be, but against them who rejected a great part of the Scripture, for no other reason but *because it was repugnant to their doctrin, and corrupted other parts with their additions and detractions, and perverted the remainder with divers absurd interpretations*: So *Tertullian* not a leaf before the words by you cited. Nay they urg'd it against them who *when they were confuted out of Scripture, fell to accuse the Scriptures themselves as if they were not right, and came not from good authority, as if they were various one from another, and as if truth could not be found out of them, by those who know not Tradition, for that it was not delivered in writing*, (they did mean wholly,) *but by word of mouth: And that thereupon* Paul *also said, we speak wisdom amongst the perfect*. So *Irenæus* in the very next Chapter before that which you alledge. Against these men being thus necessitated to do so, they did urge Tradition, but what or whose Tradition was it? Certainly no other, but the joint Tradition of all the Apostolique Churches with one mouth and one voice teaching the same doctrin. Or if, for brevity sake, they produce the Tradition of any one Church, yet is it apparent, that, that one was then in conjunction with all the rest; *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, testifie as much in the words cited, and S. *Austin*, in the place before alledged by me. This Tradition they did urge against these men, and in a time, in comparison of ours, almost contiguous to the Apostles: So near, that one of them, *Irenæus*, was Scholar to one who was Scholar to S. *John* the Apostle. *Tertullian* and *Origen* were not an age remov'd from him: and the last of them all, little more then an age from them. Yet after all this they urg'd it not as a demonstration, but only as a very probable argument, far greater then any their Adversaries could oppose against it. So *Tertullian* in the place above quoted §. 5. *How is it likely that so many and so great Churches should err in one faith* (it should be, should have erred into one faith.) And this was the condition of this argument as the Fathers urg'd it. Now if you having to deal with us, who question no Book of Scripture, which was not anciently questioned by some whom you your selves esteem good Catholiques; nay who refuse

refuse not to be tried by your own Canon, and your own Translation, who in interpreting Scriptures are content to allow of all those rules which you propose, only except that we will not allow you to be our Judges; if you will come fifteen hundred years after the Apostles, a fair time for the purest Church to gather much dross and corruption, and for the *mysterie of iniquity* to bring its work to some perfection, which *in the Apostles time began to work*; If I say) you will come thus long after, and urge us with the single Tradition of one of these Churches, being now Catholique to it self alone, and Heretical to all the rest: nay not only with her ancient and original Traditions, but also with her post-nate introduc'd Definitions, and these as we pretend repugnant to Scripture, and ancient Tradition, and all this to decline an indifferent trial by Scripture, under pretence (wherein also you agree with the calumny of the old Heretiques) that *all necessary truth cannot be found in them without recourse to Tradition:* If, I say, notwithstanding all these differences, you will still be urging us with this argument, as the very same and of the same force with that wherewith the fore-mentioned Fathers urg'd the old Heretiques: certainly this must needs proceed from a confidence you have, not only that we have no School-Divinity, nor Metaphysicks, but no Logick or common sense; that we are but pictures of men, and have the definition of rational creatures given us in vain.

41 But now suppose I should be liberal to you, and grant what you cannot prove, that the Fathers make Succession a certain and perpetual mark of the true Church; I beseech you what will come of it? What, that want of Succession is a certain sign of an Heretical company? Truly if you say so, either you want Logick, which is a certain sign of an ill disputer: or are not pleas'd to use it, which is a worse. For speech is a certain sign of a living man, yet want of speech is no sure argument that he is dead: for he may be dumb and yet living still, and we may have other evident tokens that he is so, as eating, drinking, breathing, moving: So, though the constant and universal delivery of any doctrin by the Apostolique Churches, ever since the Apostles, be a very great argument of the truth of it, yet there is no certainty, but that truth, even Divine truth, may, through mens wickedness, be contracted from its universality, and interrupted in its perpetuity, and so lose this argument, and yet not want others to justifie and support it self. For it may be one of those principles which God hath written in all mens hearts, or a conclusion evidently arising from them: It may be either contain'd in Scripture in expres terms, or deducible from it by apparent consequence. If therefore you intend to prove want of a perpetual Succession of Professors a certain note of Heresie, you must not content your self to shew, that, having it, is one sign of truth; but you must shew it to be the only sign of it and inseparable from it. But this, if you be well advis'd, you will never undertake; First, because it is an impossible attempt: and then because, if you do it, you will marr all: for by proving this an inseparable sign of Catholique doctrin, you will prove your own, which apparently wants it in many points, not to be Catholique. For whereas you say *this Succession requires two things, agreement with the Apostles doctrin, and an uninterrupted conveyance of it down to them that challenge it*: It will be prov'd against you, that you fail in both points; and that some things wherein you agree with the Apostles have not been held alwayes, as, your condemning the Doctrine of the Chiliasts, and

holding

holding the Euchariſt not neceſſary for Infants; and that in many other things you agree not with them, nor with the Church for many ages after. For example; In mutilation of the Communion, in having your Service in ſuch a language as the Aſſiſtants generally underſtand not, your offering to Saints, your picturing of God, your worſhipping of Pictures.

42 *Ad §. 24.* As for *Univerſality of place, the want whereof you object to Proteſtants as a mark of Hereſie*: You have not ſet down clearly and univocally what you mean by it, Whether univerſality of fact, or of right: and if of fact, Whether abſolute or comparative: and if comparative, Whether of the Church in compariſon of any other Religion, or only of heretical Chriſtians: or, if in compariſon of theſe, whether in compariſon of all other Sects conjoyn'd, or in compariſon only of any One of them. Nor have you proved it by any good argument in any ſenſe to be a certain mark of hereſie: For thoſe places of S. *Auſtin* do not deſerve the name. And truly in my judgment you have done adviſedly in proving it no better. For as for Univerſality of right, or a right to Univerſality, all Religions claim it, but only the true has it; and which has it, cannot be determin'd, unleſs it be firſt determin'd which is the true. An abſolute Univerſality and diffuſion through all the world if you ſhould pretend to, all the world would laugh at you. If you ſhould contend for latitude with any one Religion, *Mahumetiſm* would carry the victory from you. If you ſhould oppoſe yourſelves againſt all other Chriſtians beſides you, it is certain you would be caſt in this ſuit alſo. If laſtly, being hard driven you ſhould pleaſe your ſelves with being more than any one Sect of Chriſtians, it would preſently be replied, that it is uncertain whether now you are ſo, but moſt certain that the time has been when you have not been ſo. Then when the (a) *whole world wondred that it was become Arrian*: then when Athanaſius *oppos'd the world, and the world* Athanaſius: then when (b) your *Liberius* having the contemptible paucity of his adherents objected to him as a note of error, anſwered for himſelf, *There was a time when there were but three oppoſed the decree of the King, and yet thoſe three were in the right, and the reſt in the wrong*: then when the *Profeſſors of error ſurpaſſed the number of the Profeſſors of truth in proportion, as the ſands of the Sea, do the Stars of the Heaven.* (As (c) S. *Auſtin* acknowledgeth:) then when (d) *Vincentius* confeſſeth, that *the poyſon of the Arrians had contaminated, not now ſome certain portion, but almoſt the whole World*: then when the author of *Nazianzen*'s life teſtifies, *That* e) *the Hereſie of* Arrius, *had poſſeſſed in a manner the whole extent of the world*; and when *Nazianzen* found cauſe to cry out, (f) *Where are they who reproach us with our poverty, who define the Church by the multitude, and deſpiſe the little flock? They have the People, but we the Faith.* And laſtly, when *Athanaſius* was ſo overborn with Shoks and Floods of Arrians, that he was enforc'd to write a Treatiſe on purpoſe (g) againſt thoſe, *who judge of the truth only by plurality of adherents.* So that if you had prov'd want of Univerſality, even thus reſtrained, to be an infallible note of hereſie, there would have been no remedie but you muſt have confeſſed, that the time was when you were heretiques. And beſides, I ſee not how you would have avoided this great inconvenience, of laying grounds and ſtoring up arguments for Antichriſt, againſt he comes, by which he may prove his Company the true Church. For it is evident out of Scripture, and confeſſed by you, that though his time be not long, his dominion ſhall be very large; and that the true Church ſhall be then, *the woman driven into the wilderneſs.*

(a) *Hier. Cont. Luciferianos.*

(b) *In Theod. Hiſt. l. 16. c. 2.*

(c) *In ep. 43 ad Vincentium.*

(d) *Commentorii lib. 1. c. 4.*

(e) *In vita Nazianz.*

(f) *In Orat. Arian. & pro ſe ipſo.*

(g) *To. 2.*

43 *Ad*

43 *Ad §. 25. & 26.* The remainder of this Chapter if I would deal ſtrictly with you, I might let paſs as impertinent to the queſtion now diſputed. For whereas your argument promiſes that this whole Chapter ſhall be imployed in proving *Luther* and the Proteſtants guilty of Hereſie, here you deſert this queſtion, and ſtrike out into another accuſation of them, that *their faith even of the truth they hold, is not indeed true faith*. But put caſe it were not, does it follow, that the having of this faith makes them Heretiques, or that they are therefore Heretiques becauſe they have this faith? *Ariſtotle* believed there were Intelligences which moved the Sphears; he believed this with an humane perſwaſion, and not with a certain, obſcure, prudent, ſupernatural faith: and will you make *Ariſtotle* an Heretique, becauſe he believed ſo? You believe there was ſuch a man as *Julius Cæſar*, that there is ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*, and your belief hereof has not theſe qualifications which you require to divine faith: And will you be content that this ſhall paſs for a ſufficient proof that you are an Heretique? Hereſie you have defin'd above to be a voluntary error: but he that believes truth, though his belief be not qualified according to your mind, yet ſure in believing truth he believes no error; and from hence according to ordinary Logick me-thinks it ſhould follow, that ſuch a man for doing ſo, cannot be guilty of Hereſie.

44 But you will ſay, though he be not guilty of Hereſie for believing theſe truths, yet if his faith be not ſaving, to what purpoſe will it be? Truly very little to the purpoſe of Salvation, as little as it is to your proving Proteſtants guilty of Hereſie. But out of our wonted indulgence, let us pardon this fault alſo, and do you the favour to hear what you can ſay, to beget this faith in us, that indeed we have no faith, or at leaſt not ſuch a *faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*. Your diſcourſe upon this point, you have, I know not upon what policy, diſ-joynted, and given us the grounds of it in the beginning of the Chapter, and the ſuperſtructure here in the end. Them I have already examined, and for a great part of them, proved them vain and deceitful. I have ſhewed by many certain arguments, that though the ſubject matter of our faith be in it ſelf moſt certain, yet that abſolute certainty of adherence, is not required to the eſſence of faith, no nor to make it acceptable with God, but that to both theſe effects it is ſufficient, if it be firm enough to produce Obedience and Charity. I have ſhewed beſides, that Prudence is rather commendable in faith, than intrinſecal and eſſential to it. So that whatſoever is here ſaid, to prove the faith of Proteſtants no faith, for want of certainty or for want of prudence, is already anſwered before it is objected: for the foundation being deſtroyed, the building cannot ſtand. Yet for the fuller refutation of all pretences, I will here make good, that to prove our faith deſtitute of theſe qualifications, you have produc'd but vain Sophiſms, and for the moſt part, ſuch arguments as return moſt violently upon your ſelves. Thus then you ſay.

45 *Firſt, that their belief wanteth certainty, I prove, becauſe they denying the univerſal Infallibility of the Church, can have no certain ground to know what objects are revealed or teſtified by God.* But if there be no other ground of certainty but your Churches infallibility, upon what certain ground do you know that your Church is infallible? Upon what certain ground do you know all thoſe things which muſt be known before you can know that your Church is infallible? As, that there is a God: that God hath promiſed

promised his assistance to your Church in all her Decrees: that the Scripture wherein this promise is extant, is the word of God: that those texts of Scripture which you alledge for your infallibility, are incorrupted: that that which you pretend is the true sense of them? When you have produc'd certain grounds for all these things, I doubt not but it will appear, that we also may have grounds certain enough to believe our whole Religion, which is nothing else but the Bible, without dependance on the Churches infallibility. Suppose you should meet with a man that, for the present, believes neither Church, nor Scripture, nor God, but is ready and willing to believe them all, if you can shew some sufficient grounds to build his faith upon; will you tell such a man, There are no certain grounds, by which he may be converted; or there are? If you say the first, you make all Religion an uncertain thing: If the second, then either you must ridiculously perswade, that your Church is infallible because it is infallible, or else that there are other certain grounds besides your Churches infallibility.

46. But you proceed and tell us, that *Holy Scripture is in it self most true and infallible, but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Translations be faithful, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture.* Answ. But all these things must be known, before we can know the direction of your Church to be infallible, for no other proof of it can be pretended, but only some Texts of Canonical Scripture, truly interpreted: Therefore either you are mistaken, in thinking there is no other means to know these things, but your Churches infallible direction; or we are excluded from all means of knowing her direction to be infallible.

47 *But Protestants, though, as you suppose, they are perswaded their own opinions are true, and that they have used such means as are wont to be prescribed for understanding the Scripture, as Prayer, conferring of Texts,* &c. *yet by their disagreement shew, that some of them are deceived. Now they hold all the Articles of their faith, upon this only ground of Scripture, interpreted by these rules, and therefore it is clear, that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all.* The first of these suppositions must needs be true, but the second is apparently false: I mean, that every Protestant is perswaded that he hath used those means which are prescribed for understanding of Scripture. But that which you collect from these suppositions is clearly inconsequent: and by as good Logick you might conclude, that Logick and Geometry stand upon no certain grounds, that the rules of the one, and the principles of the other do sometimes fail, because the disagreement of Logicians and Geometricians shew, that some of them are deceived. Might not a Jew conclude as well against all Christians, that they have no certain ground whereon to rely in their understanding of Scripture, because their disagreements shew that some are deceived; because some deduce from it the infallibility of a Church, and others no such matter. So likewise a Turk might use the same argument against both Jews and Christians, and an Atheist against all Religions, and a Sceptick against all Reason. Might not one say, Mens disagreement in Religion, shews that there is no certainty in any; and the other, that experience of their contradictions teacheth, that the rules of reason do sometimes fail? Do not you see and feel how void of reason and how full of impiety your sophistry is? And how, transported with zeal against Protestants, you urge arguments against them,

them, which if they could not be answered, would overthrow not only your owne, but all Religion? But God be thanked, the answer is easie and obvious! For let men but remember not to impute the faults of men but only to men, and then it will easily appear, that there may be sufficient certainty in Reason, in Religion, in the rules of interpreting Scripture, though men through their faults, take not care to make use of them, and so run into divers errors and dissentions.

48. *But Protestants cannot determine what points be fundamental, and therefore must remain uncertain, whether or no they be not in some fundamental error.* Answ. By like reason since you acknowledg, that every error in points defin'd and declared by your Church destroies the substance of faith, and yet cannot determine what points be defined, it followeth that you must remain uncertain, whether or no you be not in some fundamental error, and so want the substance of faith, without which there can be no hope of salvation. Now that you are uncertain what points are defined, appears from your own words, c. 4. §. 3. of your second Part, where, say you, *No less impertinent is your discourse concerning the difficulty to know what is Heresie: For we grant that it is not alwaies easy to determine in particular occasions, whether this or that Doctrin be such, because it may be doubtful, whether it be against any Scripture, or divine Tradition, or definition of the Church.* Neither were it difficult to extort from you this confession, by naming divers Points, which some of you say are defin'd, others the contrary. And others hang in suspense, and know not what to determin. But this I have done elsewhere: as also I have shewed plainly enough that though we cannot perhaps say in particular, Thus much, and no more is fundamental, yet believing all the Bible, we are certain enough that we believe all that is fundamental. As he that, in a Receit, takes twenty ingredients, whereof ten only are necessary, though he know not which those ten are, yet taking the whole twenty he is sure enough that he has taken all that are necessary.

49. *Ad §. 29. But that he who erreth against any one revealed truth loseth all Divine Faith, is a very true doctrin delivered by Catholique Divines,* (you mean your own) *with so general a consent, that the contrary is wont to be censur'd as temerarious: Now certainly some Protestants must do so, because they hold contradictions which cannot all be true: Therefore some of them at least, have no divine faith.* Answ. I pass by your weakness, in urging Protestants with the authority of your Divines, which yet in you might very deservedly be censur'd. For when D. *Potter*, to shew the many actual dissentions between the Romish Doctors, notwithstanding their braggs of potential Unity, referres to *Pappus*, who has collected out of *Bellar.* their contradictions, and set them down in his own words to the number of 237. and to *Flacius, de Sectis & Controversiis Religionis Papisticæ*; you making the very same use of M. *Breerely* against Protestants, yet jeer and scorn D. *Potter*, as if he offer'd you for a proof, the bare authority of *Pappus* and *Flacius*, and tell him, which is all the Answer you vouchsafe him, *It is pretty that he brings* Pappus *and* Flacius, *flat Heretiques, to prove your many contradictions:* As if he had proved this with the bare authoritie, the bare judgement of these men, which sure he does not, but with the formall words of *Bellarmine* faithfully collected by *Pappus*. And why then might not we say to you, Is it not prettie that you bring *Breerely* as flat

an Heretique as *Pappus* or *Flacius*, to prove the contradictions of Protestants? Yet had he been so vain as to press you with the meer authority of Protestant Divines in any point, me-thinks, for your own sake, you should have pardon'd him, who here and in many other places, urge us with the judgement of your Divines as with weighty arguments. Yet if the authority of your Divines were even Canonical, certainly nothing could be concluded from it in this matter, there being not one of them, who delivers for true doctrin this Position of yours, thus nakedly set down, *That any error against any one revealed truth destroies all divine faith.* For they all require, (not your self excepted) that this truth must not only be revealed, but revealed publiquely, and (all things considered) sufficiently propounded to the erring Party, to be one of those, which God under pain of damnation commands all men to believe. And therefore the contradiction of Protestants, (though this vain doctrin of your Divines were supposed true, is but a weak argument) That any of them have no divine Faith seeing you neither have, nor ever can prove, (without begging the Question of your Churches infallibility,) that the truths about which they differ, are of this quality and condition. But though out of courtesie we may suppose this doctrin true, yet we have no reason to grant it, nor to think it any thing but a vain and groundless fancie: and that this very weak and inartificial argument, from the authority of your Divines, is the strongest pillar which it hath to support it. Two reasons you alleadge for it out of *Thomas Aquinas*, the first whereof vainly supposeth against reason and experience, that *by the commission of any deadly sinne, the habit of Charitie is quite extirpated.* And for the second, though you cry it up for an *Achilles*, and think like the Gorgons head it will turne us all into stone, and in confidence of it, insult upon Doctor *Potter* as if he durst not come neare it, yet in very truth having considered it well, I finde it a serious, grave, prolixe, and profound *nothing*. I could answer it in a word, by telling you, that it begges without all proof or colour of proof, the main Question between us, That the infallibilitie of your Church is either the formal motive, or rule, or a necessarie condition of faith: which you know we flatly deny, and therefore all that is built upon it has nothing but wind for a foundation. But to this answer I will adde a large confutation of this vain fancie, out of one of the most rational and profound Doctors of your own Church, I mean *Estus*, who upon the third of the *Sent.* the 23. *dist.* the 13. ℣. writes thus, *It is disputed* (saith he) *whether in him who believes some of the Articles of our faith, and disbelieves others, or perhaps some one, there be faith properly so called in respect of that which he does believe? In which question we must before all, carefully distinguish between those, who retaining a general readiness to believe whatsoever the Church believes, yet erre by ignorance in some Doctrin of faith, because it is not as yet sufficiently declared to them that the Church does so believe; and those who after sufficient manifestation of the Churches Doctrin, do yet choose to dissent from it, either by doubting of it, or affirming the contrary. For of the former the answer is easie; but of these, that is, of Heretiques retaining some part of wholesome Doctrin, the question is more difficult, and on both sides by the Doctors probably disputed. For that there is in them true faith of the Articles wherein they do not erre, first experience seems to convince: For many at this day denying,*

for

for example ſake, Purgatory or Invocation of Saints, nevertheleſs firmly hold, as by divine revelation, that God is Three and One, that the Son of God was incarnate and ſuffered, and other like things. As anciently the Novatians, excepting their peculiar error, of denying reconciliation to thoſe that fell in perſecution, held other things in common with Catholiques: So that they aſsiſted them very much againſt the Arrians, as Socrates relates in his Eccl. Hiſt. Moreover the ſame is proved by the example of the Apoſtles, who in the time of Chriſt's paſsion being ſcandaliz'd, loſt their faith in him: as alſo, Chriſt after his reſurrection upbraids them with their incredulity, and calls Thomas incredulous, for denying the Reſurrection, John 20. *Whereupon S.* Auſtin *alſo in his preface upon the* 96 Pſalme *ſaith, That after the Reſurrection of Chriſt, the faith of thoſe that fell was reſtored again. And yet we muſt not ſay, that the Apoſtles then loſt the faith of the Trinity, of the Creation of the world, of Eternal life, and ſuch like other Articles. Beſides, the Jewes before Chriſts comming, held the faith of one God the Creator of Heaven and Earth: who although they loſt the true faith of the Meſsias by not receiving Chriſt; yet we cannot ſay, that they loſt the faith of one God, but ſtill retained this Article as firmely as they did before.*

Add hereunto, that neither Jews nor Heretiques ſeem to lye, in ſaying, they believe either the books of the Prophets, or the four Goſpels: it being apparent enough, that they acknowledge in them Divine Authority, though they hold not the true ſenſe of them, to which purpoſe is that in the Acts, chap. 20. *Believeſt thou the Prophets? I know that thou believeſt. Laſtly, it is manifeſt, that many gifts of God, are found even in bad men, and ſuch as are out of the Church; therefore nothing hinders but that Jews and Heretiques, though they erre in many things, yet in other things may be ſo divinely illuminated as to believe aright. So S.* Auſtine *ſeems to teach in his book* De Unico Baptiſmo contra Petilianum *c.* 3. *in theſe words: When a Jew comes to us to be made a Chriſtian, we deſtroy not in him God's good things, but his own ill. That he believes, One God is to be worſhipped, that he hopes for eternal life, but he doubts not of the Reſurrection we approve and commend him: we acknowledge, that as he did believe theſe things, ſo he is ſtill to believe them; and as he did hold, ſo he is ſtill to hold them. Thus he: ſubjoyning more to the ſame purpoſe in the next, and again in the* 26 *Chapter, and in his third Book,* De Bapt. contr. Donat. cap. ult. *and upon* Pſal. 64. *But now this reaſon ſeems to perſwade the contrary: Becauſe the formal object of faith ſeems to be the firſt verity, as it is manifeſted by the Churches Doctrin as the Divine and infallible Rule; wherefore, whoſoever adheres not to this Rule, although he aſſent to ſome matters of faith, yet he embraces them not with faith, but with ſome other kind of aſſent: as if a man aſſent to a concluſion, not knowing the reaſon by which it is demonſtrated, he hath not true knowledge, but an opinion only of the ſame concluſion. Now that an Heretique adheres not to the rule aforeſaid, it is manifeſt: Becauſe if he did adhere to it, as divine and infallible, he would receive all without exception, which the Church teacheth, and ſo would not be an Heretique. After this manner diſcourſeth Saint* Thom. 2. 2. q. 5. art. 3. *From whom yet* Durand *diſſents upon this diſtinction, thinking there may be in an Heretique true faith, in reſpect of the Article in which he doth not erre. Others, as* Scotus *and* Bonaventure, *define not the matter plainly, but ſeem to chooſe a middle way.*

To the authority of S. Austin *and these School-men, this may be adjoyned, That it is usual with good Christians to say, that Heretiques have not the entire faith. Whereby it seems to be intimated, that some part of it they do retain. Whereof this may be another reason: That if the truths which a Jew or a Heretique holds, he should not hold them by faith, but after some other manner, to wit, by his own proper will and judgment, it will follow, that all the excellent knowledge of God and divine things, which is found in them is to be attributed not to the grace of God, but the strength of Free-will: which is against* S. Austine, *both elsewhere, and especially in the end of his book* De potentia.

As for the reason alleaged to the contrary, We answer: It is impertinent to faith, by what means we believe the prime Verity, that is by what means God useth to confer upon men the gift of faith. For although now the ordinary means be the Testimony and teaching of the Church, yet it is certain that by other means, faith hath been given heretofore and is given still. For many of the Ancients, as Adam, Abraham, Melchisedeck, Job, *received faith by special revelation; the Apostles by the Miracles and preaching of Christ; others again by the preaching and miracles of the Apostles; And Lastly others, by other means, when as yet they had heard nothing of the infallibility of the Church. To little Children by Baptism, without any other help, faith is infus'd: And therefore it is possible, that a man not adhering to the Churches doctrin as a Rule infallible, yet may receive some things for the word of God, which do indeed truly belong to the faith either; because they are now, or heretofore have been confirm'd by miracles; or because he manifestly sees that the ancient Church taught so; or upon some other inducement. And yet nevertheless we must not say, that Heretiques and Jewes do hold the Faith, but only some part of the Faith. For the Faith signifies an entire thing, and compleat in all parts; whereupon an Heretique is said to be simply an Infidel, to have lost the Faith, and, according to the Apostle,* 1 Tim. 1. *to have made shipwrack of it, although he holds some things, with the same strength of assent and readiness of will, wherewith by others are held all those points which appertain to the Faith.* And thus farre *Æstius*. Whose discourse I presume may pass for a sufficient refutation of your argument out of *Aquinas*. And therefore your Corollaries drawn from it, That *every errour against faith, involves opposition against God's testimony*, That *Protestants have no Faith, no certainty*, And that *you have all Faith*, must together with it fall to the ground.

50. But, *If Protestants have certainty, they want obscurity, and so have not that faith, which as the Apostle saith is of things not appearing.* This argument you prosecute in the next Paragraph; But I can find nothing in it, to convince or perswade me that Protestants cannot have as much certainty as is required to faith, of an object not so evident as to beget science. If obscurity will not consist with certainty in the highest degree, then you are to blame for requiring to faith contradicting conditions. If certainty and obscurity will stand together, what reason can be imagin'd that a Protestant may not entertain them both as well as a Papist? Your bodies and souls, your understandings and wills are, I think, of the same condition with ours: And why then may not we be certain of an obscure thing as well as you? And as you make this long discourse against Protestants, why may not we putting Church instead of Scripture, send it back again to you? And say;

If

If Papiſts have certainty, they want obſcurity, and ſo have not that faith, which, as the Apoſtle ſaith, is of things not appearing, *or not neceſſitating our underſtanding to an aſſent? For the whole edifice of the faith of Papiſts is ſetled on theſe two principles, Theſe particular propoſitions are the propoſitions of the Church, And the ſenſe and meaning of them is clear and evident, at leaſt in all points neceſſary to ſalvation. Now theſe principles being once ſuppos'd, it clearly followeth, that what Papiſts believe as neceſſary to ſalvation is evidently known by them to be true, by this argument; It is certain and evident, that whatſoever is the word of God or Divine Revelation is true; But it is certain and evident that theſe propoſitions of the Church in particular are the word of God and Divine Revelations; Therefore it is certain and evident, that all propoſitions of the Church are true; Which concluſion I take for a Major in a ſecond argument, and ſay thus; It is certain and evident that all propoſitions of the Church are true; But it is certain and evident, that ſuch particulars, for example, The lawfulneſs of the halfe Communion, The lawfulneſs and expedience of Latine Service, the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, &c. are the Propoſitions of the Church; Therefore it is certain and evident that theſe particular objects are true. Neither will it avail you to ſay, that the ſaid principles are not evident by natural diſcourſe, but only by the eye of reaſon clear'd by grace: For ſupernatural evidence, no leſs (yea rather more) drowns and excludes obſcurity, than natural evidence doth. Neither can the Party ſo enlightned, be ſaid voluntarily to captivate his underſtanding to that light, but rather his underſtanding is by neceſſity made captive and forc'd not to disbelieve what is preſented by ſo clear a light. And therefore your imaginary faith is not the true faith defined by the Apoſtle, but an invention of your own.*

And having thus cryed quittance with you, I muſt intreat you to deviſe (for truly I cannot) ſome anſwer to this argument, which will not ſerve in proportion to your own. For I hope you will not pretend that I have done you injurie, in ſetling your faith upon principles which you diſclaim. And if you alleadge this diſpar tie, That you are more certain of your principles than we of ours, and yet you do not pretend that your principles are ſo evident, as we do that ours are: what is this to ſay, but that you are more confident than we, but confeſs you have leſs reaſon for it? For the evidence of the thing aſſented to, be it more or leſs, is the reaſon and cauſe of the aſſent in the underſtanding. But then beſides, I am to tell you, that you are here, as every where extreamely, if not affectedly, miſtaken in the doctrin of Proteſtants; who though they acknowledge, that the things which they believe are in themſelves as certain as any demonſtrable or ſenſible verities, yet pretend not that their certainty of adherence is moſt perfect and abſolute, but ſuch as may be perfected and increas'd as long as they *walk by faith and not by ſight.* And conſonant hereunto is their doctrin touching the evidence of the objects whereunto they adhere. For you abuſe the world and them, if you pretend that they hold the firſt of your two principles, That theſe particular Books are the word of God, (for ſo I think you mean) either to be in it ſelfe evidently certain, or of it ſelf, and being deveſted of the motives of credibility, evidently credible: For they are not ſo fond as to conceive, nor ſo vain as to pretend, that all men do aſſent to it, which they would if it were evidently certain: nor ſo ridiculous as to imagine, that if an Indian that never heard of Chriſt or Scripture, ſhould by chance find a Bible in his owne Language, and were able to

read it, that upon the reading it he would certainly without a miracle believe it to be the word of God: which he could not chuſe if it were evidently credible. What then do they affirm of it? Certainly, no more than this, that whatſoever man that is not of a perverſe minde, ſhall weigh with ſerious and mature deliberation, thoſe great moments of reaſon which may incline him to believe the Divine authority of Scripture, and compare them with the leight objections, that in prudence can be made againſt it, he ſhall not chuſe but finde ſufficient, nay abundant inducements, to yeeld unto it firm faith and ſincere obedience. Let that learned man *Hugo Grotius* ſpeak for all the reſt, in his Book *of the truth of Chriſtian Religion*; which Book whoſoever attentively peruſes, ſhall find that a man may have great reaſon to be a Chriſtian without dependance upon your Church for any part of it: and that your Religion is no foundation of, but rather a ſcandal and an objection againſt, Chriſtianity. He then in the laſt Chapter of his ſecond Book hath theſe excellent words, *If any be not ſatisfied with theſe arguments above-ſaid, but deſires more forcible reaſons for confirmation of the excellency of Chriſtian Religion, let ſuch know that as there are variety of things which be true, ſo are there divers wayes of proving or manifeſting the truth. Thus is there one way in Mathematicks, another in Phyſicks, a third in Ethicks, and laſtly another kind when a matter of fact is in queſtion: wherein verily we muſt reſt content with ſuch teſtimonies as are free from all ſuſpicion of untruth; otherwiſe down goes all the frame and uſe of hiſtory, and a great part of the Art of Phyſick, together with all dutifulneſs that ought to be between parents and children: for matters of practice can no way elſe be known but by ſuch teſtimonies. Now it is the pleaſure of Almighty God that thoſe things which he would have us to believe (ſo that the very belief thereof may be imputed to us for obedience) ſhould not ſo evidently appear, as thoſe things which are apprehended by ſenſe and plain demonſtration, but only be ſo farre forth revealed as may beget faith, and a perſwaſion thereof, in the hearts and minds of ſuch as are not obſtinate: That ſo the Goſpel may be as a touch-ſtone for triall of mens judgements, whether they be ſound or unſound. For, ſeeing theſe arguments whereof we have ſpoken, have induced ſo many haneſt, godly, and wiſe men to approve of this Religion, it is thereby plain enough that the fault of other mens infidelity is not for want of ſufficient teſtimony, but becauſe they would not have that to be had and embraced for truth, which is contrary to their wilful deſires; it being a hard matter for them to relinquiſh their honors, and ſet at naught other commodities; which thing they know they ought to do, if they admit of Chriſt's doctrin and obey what he hath commanded. And this is the rather to be noted of them, for that many other hiſtorical narrations are approved by them to be true, which notwithſtanding are only manifeſt by authority, and not by any ſuch ſtrong proofs, and perſwaſions, or tokens, as do declare the hiſtory of Chriſt to be true.*

52. And now you ſee, I hope, that Proteſtants neither do need nor pretend to any ſuch evidence in the doctrin they believe, as cannot well conſiſt both with the eſſence and the obedience of faith. Let us come now to the laſt Nullity which you impute to the faith of Proteſtants, and that is, *want of Prudence*. Touching which point, as I have already demonſtrated, that wiſdome is not eſſential to faith, but that a man may truly believe truth, though upon inſufficient motives; So I doubt not but I ſhall make good, that if prudence were neceſſary to faith, we have better title to it than you;

and

and that if a wiser then *Solomon* were here, he should have better reason to believe the Religion of Protestants than Papists, the Bible rather than the Councel of *Trent*. But let us hear what you can say!

53. *Ad* § 31. You demand then first of all, *What wisdome was it to forsake a Church confessedly very ancient, and besides which there could be demonstrated no other Visible Church of Christ upon earth?* I answer: Against God and truth there lies no Prescription, and therefore certainly it might be great wisdome to forsake ancient errors for more ancient Truths. One God is rather to be follow'd then innumerable worlds of men: And therefore it might be great wisdome either for the whole Visible Church, nay for all the men in the world, having wandred from the way of Truth, to return unto it; or for a part of it, nay for one man to do so, although all the world besides were madly resolute to do the contrary. It might be great wisdome to forsake the errors though of the only Visible Church, much more of the *Roman*, which in conceiving her self the whole Visible Church, does somwhat like the Frog in the Fable, which thought the ditch he liv'd in, to be all the world.

54. You demand again *What wisdome was it to forsake a Church acknowledg'd to want nothing necessary to Salvation, indued with Succession of Bishops, &c. usque ad Election or Choice?* I answer: Yet might it be great wisdome to forsake a Church not acknowledged to want nothing necessary to salvation, but accused and convicted of Many damnable errors: certainly damnable to them who were convicted of them, had they still persisted in them after their conviction; though perhaps pardonable (which is all that is acknowledg'd) to such as ignorantly continued in them. A Church vainly arrogating without possibility of proof a perpetual Succession of Bishops, holding alwaies the same doctrin; and with a ridiculous impudence pretending perpetual possession of all the world: whereas the world knowes, that a little before *Luther*'s arising, your Church was confined to a part of a part of it. Lastly a Church vainly glorying in the dependance of other Churches upon her, which yet she supports no more than those crouching Anticks which seem in great buildings to labour under the weight they bear, do indeed support the Fabrick. For a corrupted and false Church may give authority to preach the truth, and consequently against her own falshoods and corruptions. Besides, a false Church may preserve the Scripture true, (as now the old Testament is preserved by the Jewes,) either not being arriv'd to that height of impiety as to attempt the corruption of it, or not able to effect it, or not perceiving, or not regarding the opposition of it to her corruptions. And so we might receive from you lawful Ordination and true Scriptures, though you were a false Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone,) I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need we aske your leave, to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a false Church, is enough to make us a true one. As for a *Succession of men that held with us in all points of Doctrin*, it is a thing we need not, and you have as little as we. So that if we acknowledge that your Church before *Luther* was a true Church, it is not for any ends, for any dependance that we have upon you; but because we conceive that in a charitable construction, you may pass for a true Church. Such a Church (and no better) as you do somtimes acknowledge Protestants to be, that is, a Company of men, wherein some ignorant souls may be saved. So that

in

in this ballancing of Religion againſt Religion, and Church againſt Church, it ſeems you have nothing of weight and moment to put into your ſcale; nothing but ſmoak and wind, vain ſhadows and phantaſtical pretences. Yet if Proteſtants, on the other ſide, had nothing to put in their Scale but thoſe negative commendations which you are pleas'd to afford them; nothing but, No unity, nor means to procure it; no farther extent when *Luther* aroſe than *Luthers* body; no Univerſality of time or place; no Viſibility or being, except only in your Church; no Succeſſion of perſons or doctrin; no leader but *Luther*, in a quarel begun upon no ground but paſſion; no Church, no Ordination, no Scriptures but ſuch as they receiv'd from you; if all this were true, and this were all that could be pleaded for Proteſtants, poſſibly with an allowance of three grains of partiality your Scale might ſeem to turne. But then, if it may appear that part of theſe objections are falſely made againſt them, the reſt vainly; that whatſoever of truth is in theſe imputations, is impertinent to this trial, and whatſoever is pertinent is untrue; and beſides, that plenty of good matter may be alleadged for Proteſtants which is here diſſembled: Then, I hope, our cauſe may be good, notwithſtanding theſe pretences.

55. I ſay then that want of Univerſality of time and place, The inviſibility or not exiſtence of the profeſſors of Proteſtant Doctrin before *Luther*, *Luther*'s being alone when he firſt oppoſed your Church, Our having our Church, Ordination, Scriptures perſonal and yet not doctrinal Succeſſion from you, are vain and impertinent allegations, againſt the truth of our Doctrin and Church. That the entire truth of Chriſt without any mixture of error ſhould be profeſſed or believed in all places at any time, or in any place at all times, is not a thing evident in reaſon, neither have we any Revelation for it. And therefore in relying ſo confidently on it, you build your houſe upon the ſand. And what obligation we had either to be ſo peeviſh, as to take nothing of yours, or ſo fooliſh as to take all, I do not underſtand. For whereas you ſay that *this is to be chooſers and therefore Heretiques*, I tell you that though all Heretiques are chooſers, yet all chooſers are not Heretiques; otherwiſe they alſo, which chooſe your Religion muſt be Heretiques. As for *our wanting Unity and Means of proving it*, Luther's *oppoſing your Church upon meere paſſion*, *Our following private men rather than the Catholique Church* the firſt and laſt are meere untruths, for we want not Unity, nor Means to procure it, in things neceſſary. Plain places of Scripture, and ſuch as need no interpreter are our means to obtain it. Neither do we follow any private men, but only the Scripture, the word of God as our rule; and reaſon, which is alſo the gift of God given to direct us in all our actions, in the uſe of this rule. And then for *Luther*'s *oppoſing your Church upon meere paſſion*, it is a thing I will not deny, becauſe I know not his heart, and for the ſame reaſon you ſhould not have affirmed it. Sure I am, whether he oppoſed your Church upon reaſon or no, he had reaſon enough to oppoſe it. And therefore if he did it upon paſſion, we will follow him only in his action and not in his paſſion; in his oppoſition, not in the manner of it; and then I preſume you will have no reaſon to condemne us, unleſs you will ſay that a good action cannot be done with reaſon, becauſe ſome body before us hath done it upon paſſion. You ſee then, how imprudent you have been in the choice of your arguments, to prove Proteſtants unwiſe in the choice of their Religion.

56. It

56. It remains now, that I should shew that many reasons of moment may be alleaged for the justification of Protestants, which are dissembled by you, and not put into the ballance. Know then Sir, that when I say, The Religion of Protestants, is in prudence to be preferr'd before yours: as, on the one side I do not understand by your Religion, the doctrin of *Bellarmin* or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongst you, nor the Doctrin of the *Sorbon* or of the *Jesuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular Company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, *the Doctrin of the Councel of Trent*: so accordingly on the other side, by the *Religion of Protestants*, I do not understand the Doctrin of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melanchon*; nor the confession of *Augusta*, or *Geneva*, nor the Catechism of *Heidelberg*, nor the Articles of the Church of *England*, no nor the *Harmony* of Protestant Confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater Harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is, The BIBLE. The BIBLE, I say; The BIBLE only, is the Religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe, besides It, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of of it, well may they hold it as a matter of Opinion; but as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most Schismatical presumption. I for my part after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of *the true way to eternal happiness*, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this Rock only. I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councels against Councels, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a Consent of Fathers of one age against a Consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but only of Scripture, can derive it self from the Fountain, but may be plainly prov'd, either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ; or that in such an age, it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I have reason to believe: This I will profess, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this Book, and require whether I believe or no, and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no Demonstration can bee stronger than this, God hath said so therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no mans Liberty of judgement from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian: I will love no man the less, for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man than this, To believe the Scripture to be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.

57. This is the Religion which I have chosen after a long deliberation, and I am verily perswaded that I have chosen wisely, much more wisely than

than if I had guided my ſelf according to your Churches authority. For the Scripture being all true, I am ſecur'd by believing nothing elſe, that I ſhall believe no falſhood as matter of faith. And if I miſtake the ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo fall into error, yet am I ſecure from any danger thereby, if but your grounds be true: becauſe endeavouring to finde the true ſenſe of Scripture, I cannot but hold my error without pertinacy, and be ready to forſake it when a more true and a more probable ſenſe ſhall appear unto me. And then all neceſſary truth being, as I have prov'd, plainly ſet down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture, to believe all neceſſary Truth: And he that does ſo, if his life be anſwerable to his faith, how is it poſſible he ſhould fail of Salvation?

58. Beſides, whatſoever may be pretended to gain to your Church the credit of a Guide, all that and much more may be ſaid for the Scripture. Hath your Church been ancient? The Scripture is more ancient. Is your Church a means to keep men at unity? So is the Scripture, to keep thoſe that believe it and will obey it in unity of belief, in matters neceſſary or very profitable; and in unity of Charity, in points unneceſſary. Is your Church univerſal for time or place? Certainly the Scripture is more univerſal. For all the Chriſtians in the world (thoſe I mean that in truth deſerve this name,) do now, and alwayes have believed the Scripture to be the word of God, ſo much of it at leaſt, as contains all things neceſſary; whereas only you ſay, that you only are the Church of God, and all Chriſtians beſides you deny it.

59. Thirdly, following the Scripture, I follow that whereby you prove your Churches infallibility, (whereof were it not for Scripture what pretence could you have, or what notion could we have?) and by ſo doing tacitely confeſs, that your ſelves are ſurer of the truth of the Scripture than of your Churches authority. For we muſt be ſurer of the proof than of the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof.

60, Fourthly, following the Scripture, I follow that which muſt be true if your Church be true: for your Church gives atteſtation to it. Whereas if I follow your Church, I muſt follow that which, though Scripture be true, may be falſe; nay which, if Scripture be true, muſt be falſe, becauſe the Scripture teſtifies againſt it.

61. Fifthly, to follow the Scripture I have God's expreſs warrant and command, and no colour of any prohibition: But to believe your Church infallible, I have no command at all, much leſs an expreſs command. Nay I have reaſon to fear that I am prohibited to do ſo in theſe words: *Call no man Maſter on earth: They fell by infidelity, Thou ſtandeſt by faith, Be not high minded but fear: The ſpirit of truth the world cannot receive.*

62. Following your Church I muſt hold many things not only above reaſon but againſt it, if any thing be againſt it: whereas following the Scripture I ſhall believe many myſteries but no impoſſibilities; many things above reaſon, but nothing againſt it; many things which had they not been reveal'd, reaſon could never have diſcover'd, but nothing which by true reaſon may be confuted: many things which reaſon cannot comprehend how they can be, but nothing which reaſon can comprehend that it cannot be. Nay I ſhall believe nothing which reaſon will not convince that I ought to believe it: For reaſon will convince any man, unleſs he be of a perverſe mind, that the Scripture is the word of God: And then no reaſon can be greater

greater than this; God ſayes ſo, therefore it is true.

63. Following your Church I muſt hold many things which to any mans judgement that will give himſelf the liberty of judgement, will ſeem much more plainly contradicted by Scripture, than the infalliblity of your Church appears to be confirm'd by it: and conſequently muſt be ſo fooliſh as to believe your Church exempted from error upon leſs evidence, rather than ſubject to the common condition of mankind upon greater evidence. Now if I take the Scripture only for my Guide, I ſhall not need to do any thing ſo unreaſonable.

64. If I will follow your Church I muſt believe impoſſibilities, and that with an abſolute certainty upon motives which are confeſs'd to be but only *Prudential* and probable: That is with a weak foundation I muſt firmly ſupport a heavy, a monſtrous heavy building: Now following the Scripture I ſhall have no neceſſity to undergoe any ſuch difficulties.

65. Following your Church I muſt be ſervant of Chriſt and a ſubject of the King, but only *ad placitum Papæ*. I muſt be prepar'd in mind to renounce my allegiance to the King, when the Pope ſhall declare him an Heretique and command me not to obey him: and I muſt be prepar'd in mind *to eſteem Vertue Vice, and Vice Vertue, if the Pope ſhall ſo determine*. Indeed you ſay it is impoſſible he ſhould do the later; but that you know is a great queſtion, neither is it fit my obedience to God and the King ſhould depend upon a queſtionable foundation. And howſoever, you muſt grant that if by an impoſſible ſuppoſition the Pope's commands ſhould be contrary to the law of Chriſt, that they of your Religion muſt reſolve to obey rather the commands of the Pope than the law of Chriſt,. Whereas if I follow the Scripture, I may, nay I muſt, obey my Soveraigne in lawful things, though an Heretique, though a Tyrant; and though, I do not ſay the Pope, but the Apoſtles themſelves, nay *an Angel from heaven ſhould teach any thing againſt the Goſpel of Chriſt, I may, nay I muſt denounce Anathema to him.*

66. Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, which being contrary to fleſh and blood, without any aſsiſtance from worldly power, wit, or policy, nay againſt all the power and policy of the world, prevail'd and enlarg'd it ſelf in a very ſhort time all the world over; Whereas it is too too apparent, that your Church hath got and ſtill maintains her authority over mens conſcience, by counterfeiting falſe miracles, forging falſe ſtories, by obtruding on the world ſuppoſititious writings, by corrupting the monuments of former times, and defacing out of them all which any way makes againſt you, by Warres, by Perſecutions, by Maſſacres, by Treaſons, by Rebellions; in ſhort, by all manner of carnal means whether violent or fraudulent.

67. Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, the firſt preachers and Profeſſors whereof, it is moſt certain they could have no worldly ends upon the world, that they ſhould not project to themſelves by it any of the profits or honours or pleaſures of this world; but rather were to expect the contrary, even all the miſeries which the world could lay upon them. On the other ſide, the Head of your Church, the pretended Succeſſour of the Apoſtles, and Guide of faith, it is even palpable, that he makes your Religion the inſtrument of his ambition, and by it ſeeks to entitle himſelf *directly or indirectly to the Monarchy of the world*. And beſides, it is evident to any man that has but halfe an eye, that moſt of thoſe Doctrins which you add to

the

the Scripture do make one way or other, for the honour or temporal profit of the Teachers of them.

68. Following the Scripture only, I shall embrace a Religion of admirable simplicity consisting in a manner wholly in the worship of God in spirit and truth. Whereas your Church and Doctrin is even loaded with an infinitie of weak, childish, ridiculous, unsavoury Superstitions and Ceremonies, and full of that *righteousness* for which *Christ shall judge the world.*

69. Following the Scriptures I shall believe that which Universal, never-failing Tradition assures me, that it was by the admirable supernatural works of God confirm'd to be the word of God: whereas never any miracle was wrought, never so much as a lame horse cur'd in confirmation of your Churches authority and infallibility. And if any strange things have been done, which may seem to give attestation to some parts of your doctrin, yet this proves nothing but the truth of the Scripture, which foretold that (God's providence permitting it, and the wickedness of the world deserving it) *strange signes and wonders should be wrought to confirm false doctrin, that they which love not the truth, may be given over to strong delusions.* Neither does it seem to me any strange thing, that God should permit some true wonders to be done to delude them who have forged so many to deceive the world.

70. If I follow the Scripture, I must not promise my self Salvation without effectual dereliction and mortification of all vices, and the effectual practice of all Christian Vertues: But your Church opens an easier and a broader way to Heaven, and though I continve all my life long in a course of sin, and without the practice of any vertue, yet gives me assurance that I may be lett into heaven at a postern gate, even by an Act of Attrition at the hour of death, if it be joyn'd with confession, or by an act of Contrition without confession.

71. Admirable are the Precepts of piety and humility, of innocence and patience, of liberality, frugality, temperance, sobriety, justice, meekness, fortitude, constancy and gravity, contempt of the world, love of God and the love of mankind; In a word, of all vertues, and against all vice, which the Scriptures impose upon us, to be obeyed under pain of damnation: The summe whereof is in manner compriz'd in our *Saviours Sermon upon the Mount*, recorded in the 5. 6. and 7. of S. *Matthew*, which if they were generally obeyed, could not but make the world generally happy, and the goodness of them alone were sufficient to make any wise and good man believe that this Religion rather than any other, came from God the Fountain of all goodness. And that they may be generally obeyed our Saviour hath ratified them all in the close of his Sermon, with these universal Sanctions, *Not every one that sayeth Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdome, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven:* and again, *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, shall be likned unto a fooliſh man which built his house upon the sand, and the rain descended, and the flood came, and the winds blew, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.* Now your Church, notwithstanding all this, enervates and in a manner dissolves and abrogates many of these precepts teaching men that they are not lawes for all Christians, but Counsels of perfection and matters of Supererogation: that a man shall do well if he do observe them, but he shall not sin if he observe them not; That they are for them who aim at high places in heaven,

who

who aſpire with the two ſonnes of *Zebede*, to the right hand or to the left hand of Chriſt: But if a man will be content barely to go to heaven, and to be a door-keeper in the houſe of God, eſpecially if he will be content to taſte of Purgatory in the way, he may obtain it at an eaſier purchaſe! Therefore the Religion of your Church is not ſo holy nor ſo good as the Doctrin of Chriſt delivered in Scripture, and therefore not ſo likely to come from the Fountain of holineſs and goodneſs.

72. Laſtly, if I follow your Church for my Guide, I ſhall do all one, as if I ſhould follow a Company of blind men in a judgement of colours, or in the choice of a way. For every unconſidering man is blind in that which he does not conſider. Now what is your Church but a company of unconſidering men, who comfort themſelves becauſe they are a great company together; but all of them, either out of idleneſs refuſe the trouble of a ſevere tryall of their Religion, (as if heaven were not worth it); or out of ſuperſtition fear the event of ſuch a tryall, that they may be ſcrupled and ſtaggered and diſquieted by it; and therefore, for the moſt part do it not at all. Or if they do it, they do it negligently and hypocritically, and perfunctorily, rather for the ſatisfaction of others than themſelves: but certainly without indifference, without liberty of judgement, without a reſolution to doubt of it, if upon examination the grounds of it prove uncertain, or to leave it, if they prove apparently falſe. My own experience aſſures me, that in this imputation I do you no injury: but it is very apparent to all men from your ranking, *doubting of any part of your Doctrin*, among mortal ſins. For from hence it followes, that ſeeing every man muſt reſolve that he will never commit mortal ſin, that he muſt never examin the grounds of it at all, for fear he ſhould be mov'd to doubt: or if he do, he muſt reſolve that no motives, be they never ſo ſtrong ſhall move him to doubt, but that with his will and reſolution he will uphold himſelf in a firm beliefe of your Religion, though his reaſon and his underſtanding fail him. And ſeeing this is the condition of all thoſe whom you eſteem good Catholiques, who can deny, but you are a Company of men unwilling and afraid to underſtand, leſt you ſhould do good! That have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, that *have not the love of truth* (which is only to be known by an indifferent tryall,) and therefore deſerve *to be given over to ſtrong deluſions*; men that love darkneſs more than light: in a word, that you are *the blind leading the blind*; and what prudence there can be, in following ſuch Guides, our Saviour hath taught us in ſaying, *If the blind lead the blind both ſhall fall into the ditch.*

73. There remains unſpoken to in this Section, ſome places out of *S. Auſtin*, and ſome ſayings of *Luther*, wherein he confeſſes that in the Papacy are many good things. But the former I have already conſidered, and return'd the argument grounded on them. As for *Luther*'s ſpeeches, I told you, not long ſince, that we follow no private men, and regard not much what he ſaies either againſt the Church of *Rome*, or for it, but what he proves. He was a man of a vehement ſpirit, and very often what he took in hand, he did not do it but over-do it. He that will juſtifie all his ſpeeches, eſpecially ſuch as he wrote in heat of oppoſition, I believe will have work enough. Yet in theſe ſentences, though he over-reach in the particulars, yet what he ſaies in general we confeſs true, and confeſs with him *that in the Papacy are many good things*, which have come from them to us; but withal

we say there are many bad, neither do we think our selves bound in prudence either to reject the good with the bad, or to retain the bad with the good, but rather conceive it a high point of wisdome, to separate between the *pretious and the vile, to sever the good from the bad, and to put the good in vessels to be kept, and to cast the bad away; to try all things, and to hold that which is good.*

74. *Ad §.* 32. Your next and last argument against the faith of Protestants is, because *wanting Certainty and Prudence, it must also want the fourth condition, Supernaturality. For that being a humane perswasion, it is not in the essence of it supernatural: and being imprudent and rash, it cannot proceed from Divine motion, and so is not supernatural in respect of the cause from which it proceedeth.* Ans. This little discourse stands wholly upon what went before, and therefore must fall together with it. I have proved the Faith of Protestants as certain, and as prudent as the faith of Papists; and therefore if these be certain grounds of supernaturality, our faith may have it as well as yours. I would here furthermore be inform'd how you can assure us that your faith is not your perswasion or opinion (for you make them all one) that your Churches Doctrin is true? Or if you grant it your perswasion, why is it not the perswasion of men, and, in respect of the subject of it, an humane perswasion? I desire also to know, what sense there is in pretending that your perswasion is, not in regard of the object only and cause of it, but in the nature or essence of it, supernatural? Lastly, whereas you say, that *being imprudent it cannot come from divine motion*: certainly by this reason all they that believe your own Religion, and cannot give a wise and sufficient reason for it, (as millions amongst you cannot) must be condemn'd to have no supernatural faith: or if not, then without question nothing can hinder, but that the imprudent faith of Protestants may proceed from divine motion, as well as the imprudent faith of Papists.

75. And thus having weighed your whole discourse, and found it altogether lighter than vanity, why should I not invert your conclusion, and say, Seeing you have not proved that whosoever errs against any one point of Faith loseth all divine Faith: nor that any error whatsoever concerning that which by the Parties litigant may be esteem'd a matter of faith is a grievous sin, it follows not at all, that when two men hold different doctrins concerning Religion, that but one can be saved? Not that I deny, but that the sentence of Saint *Chrysostome* with which you conclude this Chapter may in a good sense be true: for oftimes by *the faith* is meant only that Doctrin which is *necessary to Salvation*, and to say that salvation may be had without any the least thing wich is necessary to salvation implyes a repugnance and destroys it self. Besides, not to believe all necessary points, and to believe none at all, is for the purpose of salvation all one; and therefore he that does so, may justly be said to destroy the Gospel of Christ, seeing he makes it uneffectual to the end for which it was intended, the Salvation of mens soules. But why you should conceive that all differences about Religion are concerning matters of faith, in this high notion of the word, for that I conceive no reason.

CHAP

CHAP. VII.

In regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones ſelf, Proteſtants are in ſtate of Sin, as long as they remain ſeparated from the Roman-*Church.*

THAT, due *Order* is to be obſerved in the Theological Vertue of *Charity*, whereby we are directed to preferre ſome Objects before others, is a truth taught by all Divines, and declared in theſe words of holy Scripture: *He hath ordered* (a) *Charity in me.* The reaſon whereof is, becauſe the infinite Goodneſs of God, which is the *formal object*, or Motive of *Charity*, and for which all other things are loved, is differently participated by different Objects; and therefore the love we bear to them for Gods ſake, muſt accordingly be unequal. In the vertue of *Faith*, the caſe is far otherwiſe; becauſe all the Objects, or points which we believe, do equally participate the divine Teſtimony or Revelation, for which we believe alike all things propounded for ſuch. For it is as impoſſible for God, to ſpeak an untruth in a ſmall, as in a great matter. And this is the ground for which we have ſo often affirmed, that any leaſt error againſt *Faith*, is injurious to God and deſtructive of Salvation. (a) *Cant.* 2, 4.

2. This order in Charity may be conſidered; Towards God; Our own ſoul; The ſoul of our Neighbour; Our own life, or goods; and the life or goods of our Nighbour. God is to be beloved above all things, both *Objectivè* (as the Divines ſpeak) that is, we muſt wiſh or deſire to God, a good more great, perfect and noble than to any, or all other things: namely, all that indeed He is, a Nature Infinite, Independent, Immenſe *&c.* and alſo *Appretiativè*, that is, we muſt ſooner loſe what good ſoever, than leave, and abandon him. In the other Objects of Charity, of which I ſpake, this order is to be kept. We may but are not bound, to preferre the life and goods of Neighbour before our own: we are bound to preferre the ſoul of our Neighbour before our own temporal goods or life, if he happen to be in extreme ſpiritual neceſſity, and that we by our aſſiſtance can ſuccour him, according to the ſaying of Saint *John*: *In this we have known* (b) *the Charity of God, becauſe he hath yeelded his life for us, and we ought to yeeld our life for our Bretheren.* And S. *Auguſtine* likewiſe ſaith: *A Chriſtian will not doubt* (c) *to loſe his own temporal life, for the eternal life of his Neighbour.* Laſtly we are to preferre the *ſpiritual* good of our own ſoule, before both the ſpiritual and temporal good of our Neighbour, becauſe as Charity doth of its own Nature, chiefly encline the perſon in whom it reſides, to love God, and to be united with him: ſo of it ſelf it enclines him to procure thoſe things whereby the ſaid Union with God is effected, rather to himſelf then to others. And from hence it follows, that in things neceſſary to ſalvation, no man ought in any caſe, or in any reſpect whatſoever, to preferre the ſpiritual good, either of any particular perſon, or of the whole world before his own ſoul; according to thoſe words of our Bleſſed Saviour: *What doth it* (d) *avail a man, if he gain the whole world, and ſuſtain the damage of his own ſoul?* And therefore (to come to our preſent purpoſe) it is directly againſt the *Order* of Charity, or againſt Charity as it hath a reference to our ſelves, which Divines call *Charitas propria*, to adventure either the *omitting* of any means neceſſary to ſalvation, or the committing of any thing repugnant to it, for whatſoever reſpect; and conſequently, if by living out of the *Roman* Church we put our ſelves in hazard either to want ſomething neceſſarily required to ſalvation, or elſe to perform ſome act againſt it, we commit a moſt grievous ſin againſt the vertue *of Charity*, as it reſpects our ſelves, and ſo cannot hope for ſalvation without repentance. (b) 1. *Joan.* 3. *v.* 16. (c) *De mendac. cap.* 6. (d) Mar. 6.

3. Now of things neceſſary to ſalvation, there are two ſorts, according to the doctrin of all Divines. Some things (ſay they) are neceſſary to ſalvation, *neceſſitate præcepti*, neceſſary only becauſe they are commanded; For, *If thou wilt* (e) *enter into life, keepe the Commandements.* In which kind of things, as probable ignorance of the Law, or of the commandement, doth excuſe the party from all faulty breach thereof; ſo likewiſe doth it not exclude ſalvation in caſe of ignorance. Some other things are ſaid to be neceſſary to ſalvation *neceſſitate medii, finis*, or *ſalutis*; becauſe they are Means appointed by God to attain our *End* of eternal *ſalvation*, in ſo ſtrict a manner, that it were *preſumption* to *hope* for Salvation without them. And as the former means are ſaid to be *neceſſary*, becauſe they are *commanded*; ſo the latter are commonly ſaid to be *commanded*, becauſe they are *neceſſary*, that is: Although there were no other ſpecial precept concerning them; yet ſuppoſing they be once appointed as means abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them, in vertue of that univerſal precept of Charity, which obligeth every man to procure the ſalvation of his own ſoul. In this ſort *divine infallible Faith* is neceſſary to ſalvation; as likewiſe Repentance of every deadly ſin, and in the doctrin of Catholiques, Baptiſm *in re*, that is, in *Act*, to Children, and for thoſe who are come to the uſe of reaſon, *in voto*, or *hearty deſire*, when they cannot have it in act. And as Baptiſm is neceſſary for remiſſion of *Original* and *Actual* ſin committed before it; ſo the Sacrament of *Confeſſion*, or pennance is neceſſary *in re* or *in voto*, in *act* or *deſire*, for the remiſſion of mortal ſins, committed after Baptiſm. The miniſter of which Sacrament of Pennance being neceſſarily a true Prieſt, true Ordination is neceſſary in the Church of God for remiſſion of ſins by this Sacrament, as alſo for other ends not belonging to our preſent purpoſe. From hence it riſeth, that no ignorance or impoſſibility can ſupply the want of thoſe means which are abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. As if, for example, a ſinner depart this world without repenting himſelf of all deadly ſins, although he die ſuddenly, or unexpectedly fall out of his wits, and ſo commit no new ſin by omiſſion of repentance; yet he ſhall be eternally puniſhed for his former ſins committed, and never repented of. If an Infant die without Baptiſm, he cannot be ſaved; not by reaſon of any actuall ſin committed by him in omitting Bap- (e) Matth. 19. 17.

tism, but for Original sin, not forgiven, by the means which God hath ordained to that purpose. Which doctrin, all, or most Protestants will (for ought I know) grant to be true, in the Children of Infidels; yea not only *Lutherans*, but also some other Protestants, as M. *Bilson* late of *Winchester* (t) and others, hold it to be true, even in the Children of the faithful. And if Protestants in general disagree from Catholiques in this point, it cannot be denyed but that our disagreement is in a point very *fundamental*. And the like I say of the Sacrament of Pennance, which they deny to be necessary to salvation, either in act or in desire; which error is likewise fundamental, because it concerns (as I said) a thing necessary to salvation: And for the same reason, if their Priesthood and Ordination be doubtful, as certainly it is, they are in danger to want a means without which they cannot be saved. Neither ought this rigour to seem strange, or unjust: For almighty God having, of his own *Goodness*, without our *merit*, first ordained man to a *supernatural* end of eternal felicity; and then, after our fall in *Adam* vouchsafed to reduce us to the attaining of that End, if his blessed *will* be pleased to limit the attaining of that End, to some means which in his infinite Wisdome he thinks most fit; who can say, Why dost thou so? Or who can *hope* for that *End*, without such *means*? Blessed be his divine Majesty, for vouchsafing to ordain us, base creatures, to so sublime an End, by any means at all!

(f) In his true difference &c. Part. 4. Pag 168. & 369.

4 Out of the foresaid difference followeth another, that (generally speaking) in things necessary only because they are commanded, it is sufficient for avoiding sin, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of some probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of vertue, learning and wisdome. Neither are we alwayes obliged to follow the most strict, and severe, or secure part, as long as the doctrin which we embrace, proceeds upon such reasons, as may warrant it to be truly probable, and prudent, though the contrary part want not also probable grounds. For in humane affairs and discourse, evidence and certainty cannot be alwayes expected. But when we treat not precisely of avoiding sin, but moreover of procuring some thing without which I cannot save it; I am obliged by the *Law* and *Order* of *Charity*, to procure as great certainty as morally I am able, and am not to follow every probable opinion or dictamen, but *tutiorem partem*, *the safer part*, because, if my *probability* prove false, I shall not *probably* but *certainly* come short of Salvation. Nay in such case, I shall incurre a new sin against the *Vertue* of *Charity* towards my *self*, which obligeth every one not to expose his soul to the hazard of eternal perdition, when it is in his power, with the assistance of Gods grace, to make the matter sure. From this very ground it is, that although some Divines be of opinion, that it is not a sin to use some *Matter* or *Form* of Sacraments, only probable, if we respect precisely the reverence or respect which is due to Sacraments, as they belong to the *Moral infused* Vertue of *Religion*; yet when they are such Sacraments, as the invalidity thereof may endanger the salvation of souls, all do with one consent agree, that it is a grievous offence to use a doubtful, or only probable *Matter* or *Form*, when it is in our power to procure certainty. If therefore it may appear, that though it were not certain that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation (as we have proved to be very certain) yet at least that it is *probable*, and withal, that there is a way more safe; it will follow out of the grounds already laid, that they are obliged by the law of Charity to embrace that safe way.

5. Now that Protestants have reason, at least to doubt in what case they stand, is deduced from what we have said, and proved about the universal infallibility of the Church, and of her being Judge of Controversies, to whom all Christians ought to submit their Judgement (as even some Protestants grant,) and whom to oppose in any one of her definitions, is a grievous sin: As also from what we have said of the *Unity*, *Universality* and *Visibility* of the Church, and of Succession of Persons, and Doctrin; Of the conditions of Divine Faith, *Certainty*, *Obscurity*, *Prudence*, and *Supernaturality*, which are wanting in the faith of Protestants; Of the frivolous distinction of points fundamental and not fundamental, (the confutation whereof proveth that *Heretiques* disagreeing among themselves in any least point, cannot have the same faith, nor be of the same Church:) Of Schism; of Heresie; of the Persons who first revolted from *Rome*, and of their Motives; of the Nature of Faith, which is destroyed by any least error, and it is certain that some of them must be in error and want the substance of true faith; and since all pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all, but that they want true faith which is a means *most absolutely necessary* to Salvation. Moreover, as I said heretofore, since it is granted that every Error in fundamentall points is damnable, and that they cannot tell in particular, what points be fundamental, it followes that none of them knowes whether he, or his Brethren, do not erre damnably, it being certain that amongst so many disagreeing Persons some must erre. Upon the same ground of not being able to assigne what points be fundamental, I say they cannot be sure whether the difference among them be fundamental or no, and consequently whether they agree in the substance of faith and hope of Salvation. I omit to adde that you want the Sacrament of Pennance, instituted for remission of sins, or at least you must confess that you hold it not necessary; and yet your own Brethern, for example the *Century-Writers* do (g) acknowledge that in times of *Cyprian*, and *Tertullian*, *Private Confession* even of *Thoughts was used*; and that it was then *commanded and thought necessary*. The like, I say, concerning your Ordination, which at least is very doubtful, and consequently all that depends thereon.

(g) *Cent* 3 *cap.* 6. *Col.* 127.

6. On the other side, that the *Roman* Church is the safer way to Heaven (not to repeat what hath been already said upon divers occasions) I will again put you in mind, that unless the *Roman* Church was the true Church there was no visible true Church upon earth. A thing so manifest, that Protestants themselves confess that more than one thousand yeers the *Roman* Church possessed the whole world, as we have shewed heretofore, out of their own (h) words: from whence it followes, that unless Ours be the true Church, you cannot pretend to any perpetual visible Church of your Own; but Ours doth not depend on yours, before which it was. And here I wish you to consider with fear and trembling, how all *Roman* Catholiques, not one excepted; that is, those very men whom you must hold not to erre damnably in their belief, unless you will destroy your own Church, and salvation; do with unanimous consent believe, and profess that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation; and then tell me,

(h) *Chap.* 5. *Num.* 9.

as

as you will answer at the last day, Whether it be not more safe, to live and die in that Church, which even your selves are forced to acknowledg *not to be cut off from hope of Salvation*, (which are your own words) than to live in a Church, which the said confessedly true Church doth firmly believe, and constantly profess not to be capable of Salvation. And therefore I conclude that, by the most strict obligation of *Charity* towards your own soul, you are bound to place it in safety, by returning to that Church, from which your Progenitors Schismatically departed; lest too late you find that saying of the holy Ghost verified in your selves: *He that loves* (i) *the danger, shall perish therein.* (i) *Eccl.* 3. 27.

7. Against this last argument of the greater security of the *Roman* Church drawn from your own confession, you bring an Objection; which in the end will be found to make for us, against your self. It is taken from the words of the Donatists, speaking to Catholiques in this manner: *Your selves confess* (k) *our Baptism, Sacraments, and Faith* (here you put an Explication of your own, and say, *for the most part*, as if any small error in faith did not destroy all Faith) *to be good and available. We deny yours to be so, and say, There is no Church, no salvation amongst you; Therefore it is safest for all to joyn with us.* (k) *Pag.* 112.

8. By your leave our Argument is not (as you say) for simple people alone, but for all them who have care to save their souls. Neither is it grounded upon your *Charitable Judgement* (as you (l) speak) but upon an inevitable necessity for you, either to grant salvation to our Church, or to entail certain damnation upon your own: because yours can have no being till *Luther*, unless ours be supposed to have been the true Church of Christ. And since you term this Argument a Charm, take heed you be none of those, who, according to the Prophet *David*, do not hear *the vice of him* (m) *who charmeth wisely*. But to come to the purpose: Catholiques never granted that the Donatists had a true Church, or might be saved: And therefore you having cited out of S. *Augustine*, the words of the Catholiques, that the Donatists had true *Baptism*, when you come to the contrary words of the *Donatists*, you adde, *No Church, No Salvation*; making the Argument to have *quinq; terminos*; without which Addition you did see, it made nothing against us: For, as I said, the Catholiques never yielded, that among the Donatists there was a true Church, or hope of Salvation. And your self, a few leaves after, acknowledge that the Donatists *maintained an error*, which *was in the Matter and Nature of it properly heretical, against that Article of the Creed, wherein we profess to believe the holy* (n) *Catholique Church*: and consequently, you cannot allow salvation to them, as you do, and must do to us. And therefore the *Donatists* could not make the like argument again Catholiques, as Catholiques make against you, who grant us salvation, which we deny to you. But at least (you will say) this Argument for the Certainty of their Baptism, was like to Ours touching the Security and Certainty of our Salvation; and therefore that Catholiques should have esteemed the Baptism of the Donatists more certain than their own, and so have alloued Rebaptization of such as were baptized by Heretiques, or sinners, as the Donatists esteemed all Catholiques to be. I answer, No. Because it being a matter of faith, that Baptism administred by Heretiques, observing due Matter, Forme, *&c.* is valid: to rebaptize any so baptized, had been both a sacriledge in reiterating a Sacrament not reiterable, and a profession also of a damnable Heresy, and therefore had not been more *safe*, but certainly *damnable*. But you confess that in the doctrin or practice of the *Roman* Church, there is no belief, or profession of any damnable error, which if there were, even your Church should certainly be no Church. To believe therefore and profess, as we do, cannot exclude Salvation, as Rebaptization must have done. But if the *Donatists* could have affirmed with truth, that, in the opinion both of Catholiques and themselves, their Baptism was good, yea and good in such sort as that unless theirs was good, that of the Catholiques could not be such: but theirs might be good, though that of the Catholiques were not: and further, that it was no damnable error to believe, that Baptism administredby the Catholiques was not good, nor that it was any Sacriledge to reiterate the same Baptism of Catholiques: If, I say, they could have truly affirmed these things, they had said somewhat, which at least had seemed to the purpose. But these things they could not say with any colour of truth, and therefore their argument was fond, and impious. But we with truth say to Protestants: You cannot but confess that our doctrin contains no damnable error, and that our Church is so certainly a true Church, that unless ours be true, you cannot pretend any; Yea you grant, that you should be guilty of Schism, if you did cut off our Church from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation: But we neither do, nor can grant that yours is a true Church, or that within it there is hope of salvation: *Therefore it is safest for you to joyne with us.* And now against whom hath your Objection greatest force? (m) *Ps.* 57. 6. (n) *Page.* 126.

9. But I wonder not a little, and so I think will every body else, what the reason may be, that you do not so much as go about to answer the argument of the *Donatists*, which you say, is all one with Ours, but referre us to S. *Augustine* there to read it; as if every one carried with him a Library, or were able to examin the place in S. *Augustine*: and yet you might be sure your Reader would be greedy to see some solid answer to an argument so often urged by us, and which indeed, unless you can confute it, ought alone to move every one who hath care of his soul, to take the safest way, by incorporating himself in our Church. But we may easily imagine the true reason of your silence: For the answer which S. *Augustin* gives to the *Donatists*, is directly against your self, and the same which I have given, Namely, that Catholiques (o) approve the Baptism of Donatists, but abhorre their heresie of Rebaptization. And that as gold is good (which is the Similitude used by (p) S. *Augustine*) yet not to be sought in company of theeves; so though Baptism be good, yet it must not be sought for in the Conventicles of Donatists. But you free us from damnable heresie, and yeeld us salvation, which I hope is to be imbraced in whatsoever Company it is found; or rather, that Company is to be imbraced before all other, in which all sides agree, that salvation may be found. We therefore must inferre, that it is safest for you to seek salvation among us. You had good reason to conceal S. *Augustines* answer to the *Donatists*. (o) *Ad lit. Petil. l.* 2. *cap.* 108. (p) *Contra Cresc. lib.* 1. *cap.* 21.

10. You frame another argument in our behalf, and make us speak thus: If Protestants *believe the* (q) *Religion* of Catholiques *to be a safe way to Heaven, why do they not follow it?* which wise argument (q) *Pag.* 79.

of your own, you answer at large, and confirme your answer by this instance; *The Jesuits and Dominicans hold different Opinions, touching Predetermination, and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin: Yet so, that the Jesuit holds the Dominicans way safe, that is, his error not damnable; and the Dominicans hold the same of the Jesuits; Yet neither of them with good consequence can press the other to believe his opinion, because by his own confession it is no damnable error.*

11. But what Catholique maketh such a wise demand as you put into our mouths? If our Religion be a safe way to heaven, that is, not damnable; why do you not follow it? As if every thing that is good, must be of necessity embraced by every body! But what think you of the Argument framed thus? Our Religion is safe even by your confession, therefore you ought to grant that all *may* embrace it. And yet further, thus: Among different Religons and *contrary* wayes to heaven, one only can be safe: But ours, by your own confession, is safe, whereas we hold that in yours there is no hope of salvation: Therefore you *may* and *ought* to imbrace ours. This is our Arguments. And if the Dominicans and Jesuits did say one to another as we say you; then one of them might with good consequence press *the other to believe his opinion.* You have still the hard fortune to be beaten with your own weapon.

12. It remaineth then, that both in regard of *Faith*, and *Charity*, Protestants are obliged to unite themselves with the Church of *Rome*. And I may adde also, in regard of the *Theological* Vertue of *Hope*, without which none can hope to be saved, and which you want, either by excess of *Confidence*, or defect by *Despaire*, not unlike to your *Faith*, which I shewed to be either deficient in *Certainty*, or excessive in *Evidence*; as likewise, according to the rigid Calvinists, it is either so strong, that once had, it can never be lost: or so more than weak, and so much nothing; that it can never be gotten. For the true Theological *Hope* of Christians, is a *Hope* which keeps a mean between *Presumption*, and *Desperation* which moves us to work our salvation with fear and trembling; which conducts us to make sure our salvation by good works, as holy Scripture adviseth: But, contrarily, Protestanes do either exclude *Hope* by *Despair*, with the Doctrin, That our Saviour died not for all, and, that such want grace sufficient to salvation; or else by vain *Presumption*, grounded upon a fantastical perswasion, that they are Predestinate; which Faith must exclude all fear, and trembling. Neither can they make their Calling *certain by good works*, who do certainly believe, that before any good works they are justified, and justified even by Faith alone, and by that Faith whereby they certainly believe they are justified. Which point some Protestants do expresly affirm to be *the soul of the Church, the principal Origin of salvation, of all other points of Doctrin, the chiefest and weightiest*; as already I have noted *Chap. 3. n. 19.* And if some Protestants do now relent from the rigour of the foresaid doctrin, we must affirm, that at least some of them want the Theological Vertue of *Hope*; yea that none of them can have true *Hope*, while they hope to be saved in the Communion of those, who defend such doctrins, as do directly overthrow all true Christian *Hope*. And for as much as concerns *Faith*, we must also inferr, that they want *Unity* therein (and consequently have none at all) by their disagreement about *the soul of the Church; the principal Origin of salvation, of all other points of Doctrin the chiefest and weightiest.* And if you want true *Faith*, you must by consequence want *Hope*, or if you hold that this *point* is not to be so indivisible on either side, but that it hath latitude sufficient to imbrace all parties, without prejudice to their salvation; notwithstanding that your Brethren hold it to be *the soul of the Church*, &c. I must repeat what I have said heretofore, that, even by this Example, it is cleer, you cannot agree what points be *fundamental*. And so (to whatsoever answer you fly) I press you in the same manner, and say, that you have no Certainty, whether you agree in fundamental points; or Unity and substance of Faith, which cannot stand with difference in fundamentals. And so, upon the whole matter, I leave it to be considered, whether, *Want of Charity can be justly charged* on us, because we affirm, that they cannot (without repentance) be saved, who want of all other the most necessary means to salvation, which are the three *Theological* Vertues, FAITH, HOPE, *and* CHARITY.

13. And now I end this *first part*, having, as I conceive, complyed with my first design, (in that measure, which Time, Commodity, scarcity of Books, and my own small Abilities could afford) which was to shew, that *Amongst men of different Religions, one side only can be saved.* For since there must be some *infallible Means* to decide all Controversies concerning Religion, and to propound truth revealed by Almighty God; and this means can be no other, but the *Visible Church of Christ*, which at the time of *Luther's* appearance was only the Church of *Rome*, and such as agreed with her: We must conclude, that whosoever opposeth himself to her definitions, or forsaketh her Communion, doth resist God himself, whose Spouse she is, and whose divine truth she propounds; and therefore becomes guilty of *Schism* and *Heresie*, which since *Luther*, his Associates, and Protestants have done, and still continue to do; it is not *Want of Charity*, but abundance of evident cause, that forceth us to declare this necessary Truth, PROTESTANCY UNREPENTED DESTROIES SALVATION.

The

The ANSWER to the SEVENTH CHAPTER.

That Protestants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themselves, to re-unite themselves to the Roman-*Church.*

THE *first four Paragraphs* of this Chapter, are wholly spent in an unnecessary introduction unto a truth, which I presume, never was, nor will be, by any man in his right wits, either denyed or question'd; and that is, That *every man in Wisdom and Charity to himself, is to take the safest way to his eternal Salvation.*

2. The *fift* and *sixt* are nothing in a manner, but references to discourses, already answered by me, and confuted in their proper places.

3. The *seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh*, have no other foundation but this false pretence, That *we confess the* Roman *Church free from damnable error*,

4. In the *twelfth* there is something that has some probability to perswade some Protestants to forsake some of their opinions, or others to leave their communion; but to prove Protestants in general, to be in the state of sin while they remain separate from the *Roman* Church, there is not one word or syllable: and besides, whatsoever argument there is in it for any purpose, it may be as forcibly return'd upon Papists, as it is urg'd against Protestants; in as much as all Papists, either hold the doctrin of Predetermination, and absolute Election, or communicate with those that do hold it. Now from this doctrin, what is more prone and obvious, than for every natural man (without Gods especial preventing grace) to make this practical collection, Either I am elected or not elected; If I be, no impiety possible can ever damne me: If not, no possible industry can ever save me? Now whether this disjunctive perswasion be not as likely (as any doctrin of any Protestants) to extinguish Christian hope, and filiall fear, and to lead some men to dispaire, others to presumption, all to a wretchless and impious life, I desire you ingeniously to inform mee! and if you deny it, assure your self you shall be contradicted and confuted by men of your own Religion and your own Society, and taught at length this charitable Doctrin, that though mens opinions may be charg'd with the absurd consequencs which naturally flow from them, yet the men themselves are not; I mean, if they perceive not the consequence of these absurdities, nor do not own and acknowledge, but disclaim and detest them. And this is all the answer which I should make to this discourse, if I should deal rigidly and strictly with you. Yet that you may not think your self contemn'd, nor have occasion to pretend, that your arguments are evaded, I will intreat leave of my Reader to bring to the test every particle of it, and to censure what deserves a censure, and to answer what may any way seem to require an answer: and then I doubt not, but what I have affirm'd in general will appear in particular.

Ad §. 1. To the *First* then I say. 1. It was needless to prove, that due Order is to be observed in any thing; much more in Charity, which being one of the best things, may be spoil'd by being disordered! Yet if it stood in need of proof, I fear this place of the Canticles, *He hath ordered Charity in me*, would be no enforcing demonstration of it. 2. The reason alledged by you why we ought *to love one object more then another, because one thing participates the Divine Goodness more then another*, is phantastical, and repugnant to what you say presently after. For by this rule, no man should love himself more than all the world; which yet you require, unless he were first vainly perswaded that he doth more participate the Divine Goodness than all the world. But the true reason why one thing ought to be lov'd more then another, is, because one thing is better then another, or because it is better to us, or because God commands us to do so, or because God himself does so, and we are to conform our affections to the will of God. 3. It is not true, that *all objects which we believe, do equally participate the Divine Testimony or Revelations:* For some are testified more evidently, and some more obscurely; and therefore whatsoever you have built upon this ground, must of necessity fall together with it. And thus much for the first number.

6. *Ad §.* 2. In the *Second*, many passages deserve a censure. For 1. it is not true that *we are to wish or desire to God a nature infinite, independent, immense:* For it is impossible I should desire to any person that which he hath already, if I know that he hath it; nor the perpetuity of it, if I know it impossible but he must have it for perpetuity. And therefore, Rejoycing only and not *Welwishing* is here the proper worke of love. 2. Whereas you say, That *in things necessary to salvation, no man ought in any case or in any respect whatsoever, to prefer the spiritual good of the whole world before his own soul:* In saying this, you seem to me to condemn one of the greatest acts of Charity, of one of the greatest Saints that ever was, I mean S. *Paul*, who *for his bretheren desir'd to be an Anathema from Christ*. And as for the Text alleadged by you in confirmation of your saying, *What doth it avail a man if he gain the whole world, and sustain the damage of his own soul!* It is nothing to the purpose: For without all question, it is not profitable for a man to do so; but the question is, whether it be not lawful for a man to forgo and part with his own particular profit, to procure the universal, spiritual, and eternal benefit of others? 3. Whereas you say, *It is directly against Charity to our selves, to adventure the omitting of any means necessary to salvation*, this is true: But so is this also, that it is directly against the same Charity, to adventure the omitting any thing, that may any way help or conduce to my salvation, that may make the way to it more secure or less dangerous. And therefore if the errors of the *Roman* Church do but hinder me in this way, or any way endanger it, I am, in Charity to my self, bound to forsake them, though they be not destructive of it. 4. Whereas you conclude, That *if by living out of the* Roman-*Church we put our selves in hazzard to want something necessary to Salvation, we commit a grievous sin against the vertue of Charity as it respects our selves*: This consequence may be good in those which are thus perswaded of the *Roman* Church, and yet live out of it. But the supposition is certainly false. We may live and dy out of the *Roman* Church, without putting our selves in any such hazard: Nay to live and dye in it is as dangerous as to shoot a gulf, which though some good ignorant

norant souls may do and escape, yet it may well be feared that not one in a hundred but miscarries.

Ad Q. 3. I proceed now to the *third Section*; and herein first I observe this acknowledgement of yours, *That in things necessary only because commanded, a probable ignorance of the commandement excuses the Party from all fault, and doth not exclude Salvation.* From which Doctrin it seems to me to follow, that seeing obedience to the *Roman* Church cannot be pretended to be necessary, but only because it is commanded, therefore not only an invincible, but even a probable ignorance of this pretended command, must excuse us from all faulty breach of it, and cannot exclude Salvation. Now seeing this command is not pretended to be expresly delivered, but only to be deduced from the word of God, and that not by the most cleer and evident consequences that may be; and seeing an infinity of great Objections lies against it, which seem strongly to prove that that is no such command, with what Charity can you suppose, that our ignorance of this command; is not at the least probable, if not, all things considered, plainly invincible? Sure I am, for my part, that I have done my true endeavour to finde it true, and am still willing to do so; but the more I seek, the farther I am from finding, and therefore if it be true, certainly my not finding it is very excusable, and you have reason to be very charitable in your censures of me. 2. Whereas you say, that *besides these things necessary because commanded, there are other things, which are commanded because necessary: of which number you make Divine infallible faith, Baptism in act for Children, and in Desire for those who are come to the use of Reason, and the Sacrament of Confession for those who have committed mortal sin*: In these words you seem to me to deliver a strange Paradoxe, *viz.* That Faith, and Baptism, and Confession, are not therefore necessary for us, because God appointed them, but are therefore appointed by God, because they were necessary for us, antecedently to his appointment: which if it were true, I wonder what it was beside God that made them necessary, and made it necessary for God to command them! Besides, in making Faith one of these necessary means, you seem to exclude Infants from Salvation: For, *Faith comes by hearing*, and they have not heard. In requiring that this Faith should be *divine and infallible*, you cast your Credence into infinite perplexity, who cannot possibly by any sure Mark discern whether their Faith be Divine or humane; or if you have any certain signe, whereby they may discern whether they believe your Churches infallibility with Divine or only with humane faith, I pray produce it, for perhaps it may serve us to shew, that our faith is divine as well as yours. Moreover, in affirming that *Baptism in act is necessary for Infants, and for men only in desire*, You seem to me in the later to destroy the foundation of the former. For if a desire of Baptism will serve men in stead of Baptism, then those words of our Saviour, *Unless a man be born again of water*, &c. are not to be understood literally and rigidly of external Baptism; for a desire of Baptism is not Baptism, and so your foundation of the absolute necessity of Baptism is destroyed. And if you may gloss the Text so far, as that men may be saved by the desire, without Baptism it self, because they cannot have, it, Why should you not gloss it a litle farther, that there may be some hope of the salvation of unbaptized infants: to whom it was more impossible to have a

desire

deſire of Baptiſm, than for the former to have the thing it ſelf? Laſtly, for your *Sacrament of Confeſſion*, we know none ſuch, nor any ſuch abſolute neceſsity of it. They that confeſs their ſins and forſake them ſhall find mercy, though they confeſs them to God only and not to men. They that confeſs them both to God and men, if they do not effectually and in time forſake them, ſhall not find mercy, 3. Whereas you ſay, that *ſuppoſing theſe means once appointed as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them*; you muſt ſuppoſe, I hope, that we know them to be ſo appointed, and that it is in our power to procure them: otherwiſe though it may be our ill fortune to fail of the end, for want of the means, certainly we cannot be obliged to procure them. For the rule of the Law is alſo the dictate of common reaſon and equity, That *no man can be obliged to what is impoſſible*. We can be obliged to nothing but by vertue of ſome command: now it is impoſsible that God ſhould command in earneſt any thing which he knows to be impoſsible. For to command in earneſt, is to command with an intent to be obeyed which is not poſsible he ſhould do, when he knows the thing commanded to be impoſsible. Laſtly, whoſoever is obliged to do any thing, and does it not, commits a fault; but Infants commit no fault in not procuring to have Baptiſm; therefore no obligation lies upon them to procure it. 4. Whereas you ſay, that *if Proteſtants diſſent from you in the point of the neceſsity of Baptiſm for infants, it cannot be denyed but that our diſagreement is in a point fundamental*; If you mean a point eſteemed ſo by you, this indeed cannot be denyed: But if you mean, a point that indeed is fundamental, this may certainly be denyed: for I deny it, and ſay, that it doth not appear to me any way neceſſary to Salvation to hold the truth, or not to hold an errour, touching the condition of theſe Infants. This is certain, and we muſt believe that God will not deal unjuſtly with them; but how in particular he will deal with them concernes not us, and therefore we need not much regard it. 5. Whereas you ſay the like of your *Sacrament of Penance*, you only ſay ſo, but your proofs are wanting. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *This rigour ought not to ſeem ſtrange or unjuſt in God, but that we are rather to bleſs him for ordaining us to Salvation by any means*: I anſwer, that it is true, we are not to queſtion the known will of God, of injuſtice; yet whether that which you pretend to be Gods will be ſo indeed, or only your preſumption, this I hope may be queſtion'd lawfully and without preſumption; and if we have occaſion we may ſafely put you in mind of *Ezechiel's* commination, againſt all thoſe who ſay, *Thus ſaith the Lord*, when they have no certain warrant or authority from him to do ſo.

8. *Ad §.* 4. In the *fourth Paragraph*, you deliver this falſe and wicked Doctrin, *that for the procuring our own ſalvation we are alwaies bound under pain of mortal ſin, to take the ſafeſt way; but for avoyding ſin we are not bound to do ſo, but may follow the opinion of any probable Doctors*, though the contrary way be certainly free from ſin, and theirs be doubtfull. Which doctrin in the former part of it, is apparently falſe. For though wiſdom and Charity to our ſelves would perſwade us alwaies to do ſo, yet many times, that way which to our ſelves and our ſalvation is more full of hazard, is notwithſtanding not only lawful but more charitable and more noble. For example, to fly from a perſecution and ſo to avoid the temptation of it, may be the ſafer way for a mans own ſalvation; yet I preſume

presume no man ought to condemn him of impiety, who should resolve not to use his liberty in this matter, but for Gods greater glory, the greater honour of truth, and the greater confirmation of his bretheren in the faith, choose to stand out the storm and endure the fiery trial, rather than avoid it; rather to put his own soul to the hazard of a temptation, in hope of Gods assistance to go through with it, than to baulk the opportunity of doing God and his bretheren so great a service. This part therefore of this Doctrin is manifestly untrue. The other, not only false but impious; for therein you plainly give us to understand, that in your judgement, a resolution to avoid sin, to the uttermost of your power, is no necessary means of Salvation; nay that a man may resolve not to do so, without any danger of damnation. Therein you teach us that we are to do more for the love of our selves, and our own happiness, than for the love of God; and in so doing contradict our Saviour, who expresly commands us, *to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength*; and hath taught us, *that the love of God consists in avoiding sin and keeping his commandements*. Therein you directly cross S. *Pauls* doctrin, who though he were a very probable Doctor, and had delivered his judgement for the *lawfulness of eating meats offered to Idols*; yet he assures us that he which should make scruple of doing so, and forbear upon his scruple should not sin, but only be *a weak brother*; whereas he, who should do it with a doubtful conscience, (though the action were by S. *Paul* warranted lawful, yet) *should sin and be condemn'd for so doing*. You pretend indeed to be rigid defenders and stout champions for the necessity of good works; but the truth is, *you speak lies in hypocrisie*, and, when the matter is well examin'd, will appear to make your selves and your own functions necessary, but obedience to God unnecessary: Which will appear to any man who considers what strict necessity the Scripture imposes upon all men, of effectual mortification of the habits of all vices, and effectual conversion to newness of life, and universal obedience, and withal remembers that an act of Attrition, which you say with Priestly Absolution is sufficient to salvation, is not mortification, which being a work of difficulty and time, cannot be perform'd in an instant. But for the present, it appears sufficiently out of this impious assertion, which makes it absolutely necessary for men, either in Act, if it be possible, or if not, in Desire, to be Baptiz'd and Absolv'd by you, and that with intention: and in the mean time warrants them that for avoiding of sin, they may safely follow the uncertain guidance of vain man, who you cannot deny may either be deceiv'd himself, or out of malice deceive them, and neglect the certain direction of God himself, and their own consciences. What wicked use is made of this Doctrin, your own long experience can better inform you, than it is possible for me to do: yet my own little conversation with you affoords one memorable example to this purpose. For upon this ground I knew a young Schollar in *Doway*, licenc'd by a great Casuist to swear a thing as upon his certain knowledge, whereof he had yet no knowledge but only a great presumption, *because* (forsooth) *it was the opinion of one Doctor that he might do so*. And upon the same ground, whensoever you shall come to have a prevailing party in this Kingdome, and power sufficient to restore your Religion, you may do it by deposing or killing the King, by blowing up of Parliaments, and by rooting out all others of a different faith from you. Nay this you may do, though in your

own

own opinion it be unlawful, becauſe * *Bellarmine*, a man with you of approved vertue, learning, and judgement, hath declared his opinion for the lawfulneſs of it in ſaying, that *want of power to maintain a rebellion, was the only reaſon that the primitive Chriſtians did not rebel againſt their perſecuting Emperors*. By the ſame rule, ſeeing the Prieſts and Scribes and Phariſees, men of greateſt repute among the Jewes for vertue, learning and wiſdome; held it a lawful and a pious work to perſecute Chriſt and his Apoſtles, it was lawful for their people to follow their leaders: for herein, according to your Doctrin, they proceeded prudently, and according to the conduct of opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men (as it ſeem'd to them) of vertue, learning and wiſdome; nay by ſuch as ſate in *Moſes* chair, and of whom it was ſaid, *Whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and do*: which Univerſal you pretend is to be underſtood univerſally, and without any reſtriction or limitation. And as lawful was it for the Pagans to perſecute the Primitive Chriſtians, becauſe *Trajan* and *Pliny*, men of great vertue and wiſdome were of this opinion. Laſtly, that moſt impious and deteſtable Doctrin, (which by a foul calumny you impute to me, who abhorre and deteſt it,) that *men may be ſaved in any Religion*, followes from this ground unavoidably. For certainly, Religion is one of thoſe things which is neceſſary only becauſe it is commanded: for if none were commanded under pain of damnation, how could it be damnable to be of any or to be of none? Neither can it be damnable to be of a falſe Religion, unleſs it be a ſin to be ſo. For neither are men ſaved by good luck, but only by obedience; neither are they damned for their ill fortune, but for ſin and diſobedience. Death is the wages of nothing but ſin: and S. *James* ſure intended to deliver the adequate cauſe of ſin and death in thoſe words, *Luſt when it hath conceived bringeth forth ſin and ſin, when it is finiſhed bringeth forth death*. Seeing therefore in ſuch things, according to your doctrin, it is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of ſome probable opinion, matur y weighed and approv'd by men of learning, vertue and wiſdome; and ſeeing neither Jews want their *Gamaliels*, nor Pagans their *Antoninus's*, nor any ſect of Chriſtians ſuch profeſſors and maintainers of their ſeveral ſects, as are eſteem'd by the people, which know no better (and that very reaſonably) men of vertue, learning, and wiſdome, it followes evidently that the embracing their religion proceeds upon ſuch reaſon as may warrent their action to be prudent, and this (ſay you) is *ſufficient for avoiding of ſin*, and therefore certainly for avoiding damnation, for *that in humane offairs* and diſcourſe, *evidence and certainty cannot be alwayes* expected. I have ſtood the longer upon the refutation of this doctrin, not only becauſe it is impious, and becauſe bad uſe is made of it, and worſe may be; but only becauſe the contrary poſition, *That men are bound for avoiding ſin alwayes to take the ſafeſt way*, is a fair and ſure foundation, for a cleer confutation of the main Concluſion, which in this Chapter you labour in vain to prove, and a certain proof that in regard of the precept of charity towards ones ſelf, and of obedience to God, Papiſts (unleſs ignorance excuſe them) are in ſtate of ſin, as long as they remain in ſubjection to the *Roman* Church.

9. For if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly it will not be hard to determin, that the way of Proteſtants muſt be more ſecure, and the *Roman* way more dangerous: Take but into your conſideration theſe enſuing controverſies: Whether it

* *Bellar. Contr. Barcl. c. 7. Inj. c. refutare conatur Barcl. verba illa Romuli. Veteres illos imperatores Conſtantium, Valentem, & cæteros nam ideò toleravit Eccleſia quod legitimè ſucceſſiſſent, ſed quod illos ſine populi detrimento coercere non poterat. Et miratur hoc idem ſcripſiſſe Bellarminum. l. 5 de Pontif. c. 7. Sed ut magis miretur, ſciat hoc idem ſenſiſſe S. Thomam 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2. ad 1. Ubi dicit Eccleſiam toleraſſe ut fideles obedirent Juliano Apoſtatæ, quia ſui novitate nondum habebant vires, compeſcendi Principes terrenos. Et poſtea, Sanctus Gregorius dicit, Nullum adverſus Juliani perſecutionem fuiſſe remedium præter Lacrimas, quoniam non habebat Eccleſia vires, quibus illius tyrannidi reſiſtere poſſet.*

it be lawful to worship Pictures? to picture the Trinity? to invocate Saints and Angels? to deny Lay-men the Cup in the Sacrament? to adore the Sacrament? to prohibit certain Orders of men and women to matry? to celebrate the publique service of God in a language which the assistants generally understand not; and you will not choose but confess that in all these you are on the more dangerous side for the committing of sin, and we on that which is more secure. For in all these things, if we say true, you do that which is impious: on the other side, if you were in the right, yet we might be secure enough, for we should only not do something which you confess not necessary to be done. We pretend, and are ready to justifie out of principles agreed upon between us, that in all these things, you violate the manifest commandements of God; and alleadge such texts of Scripture against you, as, if you would weigh them with any indifference, would put the matter out of question, but certainly you cannot with any modesty deny, but that at least they make it questionable. On the other side, you cannot with any face pretend, and, if you should, know not how to go about to prove, that there is any necessity of doing any of these things; that it is unlawful not to worship pictures, not to picture the Trinity, not to invocate Saints and Angels, not to give all men the entire Sacrament, not to adore the Eucharist, not to prohibit marriage, not to celebrate divine service in an unknown tongue: I say, you neither do nor can pretend that there is any law of God which enjoyns us, no nor so much as an Evangelical Counsel that advises us to do any of these things. Now *where no law is, there can be no sin, for sin is the transgression of the law*; It remains therefore that if your Church should forbear to do these things, she must undoubtedly herein be free from all danger and suspicion of sin; whereas your acting of them, must be, if not certainly impious, without all condradiction questionable and dangerous. I conclude therefore that which was to be concluded, that if the safer way for avoiding sin, be also (as most certainly it is) the safer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of Protestants must be more safe, and the *Roman* way more dangerous. You will say, I know, that *these things being by your Church concluded lawful, we are obliged by God, though not to do, yet to approve them: at least in your judgement we are so, and therefore our condition is as questionable as yours*. I answ. The Authority of your Church is no common principle agreed upon between us, and therefore from that you are not to dispute against us. We might press you with our judgement as well and as justly as you do us with yours. Besides, this very thing that your Church hath determin'd these things lawful, and commanded the approbation of them, is that whereof she is accused by us, and we maintain you have done wickedly, or at least very dangerously, in so determining; because in these very determinations, you have forsaken that way which was secure from sin, and have chosen that which you cannot but know to be very questionable and doubtful; and consequently have forsaken the safe way to heaven, and taken a way which is full of danger. And therefore, although if your obedience to your Church were questioned, you might flie for shelter to your Churches determinations, yet when these very determinations are accused, me thinks they should not be alleag'd in defence of themselves. But you will say, Your Church is infallible, and therefore her determinations not unlawful. Answ. They that accuse your Church of error, you may be sure do question her infallibility:

shew

shew therefore where it is written, that your Church is infallible, and the dispute will be ended. But till you do so, give me leave rather to conclude thus, Your Church in many of her determinations, chooses not that way which is most secure from sin, and therefore not the safest way to salvation; than vainly to imagine her infallible, and thereupon to believe; though she teach not the secureſt way to avoid sin, yet she teaches the certainst way to obtain salvation.

10. In the close of this Number, you say as followes, *If it may appear though not certain, yet at least probable, that Protestancy unrepented destroyes salvation, and withal that there is a safer way, it will follow that they are obliged by the law of Charity to that safe way.* Ans. Make this appear, and I will never perswade any man to continue a Protestant; for if I should, I should perswade him to continue a fool. But after all these prolix discourses, still we see you are at, *If it may appear*: From whence without all Ifs and Ands, that appears sufficiently which I said in the beginning of the *Chapter*, that the *four first Paragraphs* of this Chapter are wholly spent in an unnecessary introduction, unto that which never by any man in his right wits was denyed, That *men in wisdome and charity to themselve, are to take the safest way to eternal salvation.*

11. *Ad §.* 5. In the *fift* you begin to make some shew of arguing, and tell us, that *Protestants have reason to doubt in what case they stand, from what you have said about the Churches universal infallibility, and of her being Judge of Controversies*, &c. Ans. From all that which you have said, they have reason only to conclude that you have nothing to say. They have as much reason to doubt, whether there can be any Motion, from what *Zeno* saies in *Aristotles* Physicks, as to doubt, from what you have said, Whether the *Roman* Church may possibly erre. For this I dare say, that not the weakest of *Zeno's* arguments but is stronger than the strongest of yours, and that you would be more perplext in answering any one of them, than I have been in answering all yours. You are pleas'd to repeat two or three of them in this Section, and in all probability so wise a man as you are, if he would repeat any, would repeat the best; and therefore if I desire the Reader by these to judge of the rest, I shall desire but ordinary justice.

12. The first of them being put into form stands thus, *Every least error in faith destroys the nature of faith; It is certain that some Protestants do erre, And therefore they want the substance of Faith.* The Major of which Syllogism I have formerly confuted by unanswerable arguments out of one of your own best Authors, who shewes plainly that he hath amongst you, as strange as you make it, many other abettors. Besides, if it were true, it would conclude that either you or the Dominicans have no faith, in as much as you oppose one another as much as Arminians and Calvinists.

13. The second Argument stands thus, *Since all Protestants pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all?* Which argument if it were good, then what can hinder but this must also be so, Since Protestants and papists pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all! And this too: Since all Christians pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all! And thirdly this: Since men of all religions pretend a like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any at all! And lastly this: Since oft-times they which are abused with a specious Paralogism, pretend

the

the like certainty with them which demonstrate, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all! Certainly, Sir, Zeal and the Devil did strangely blind you, if you did not see that these horrid impieties were the immediate consequences of your positions, if you did see it, and yet would set them down, you deserve a worse censure. Yet such as these, are all the arguments wherewith you conceive your self to have prov'd undoubtedly, that *Protestants have reason, at least to doubt in what case they stand.* Neither am I afraid to venture my life upon it, that your self shall not choose so much as one out of all the pack, which I will not shew before indifferent Judges, either to be impertinent to the question, inconsequent in the deduction, or grounded upon some false, or at least uncertain foundation.

14. Your third and fourth argument may be thus put into one; *Protestants cannot tell what points in particular be fundamental; therefore they cannot tell, whether they or their brethren do not erre fundamentally, and whether their difference be not fundamental.* Both which deductions I have formerly shewed to be most inconsequent; for knowing the Scripture to contain all fundamentals (though many more points besides, which makes it difficult to say precisely what is fundamental, and what not,) knowing this, I say, and believing it, what can hinder but that I may be well assured, that I believe all fundamentals, and that all who believe the Scripture sincerely as well as I, do not differ from me in any thing fundamental?

15. In the close of this Section, you say, that *you omit to add that we want the Sacrament of Repentance, instituted for the remission of sins, or at least we must confess, that we hold it not necessary: and yet our own brethren the Century-writers acknowledge that in the times of* Cyprian *and* Tertullian, *private confession even of thoughts was used, and that it was then commanded and thought necessary; and then our Ordination,* you say, *is very doubtful, and all that depends upon it.* Ans. I also omit to answer, 1. That your brother *Rhenanus*, acknowledges the contrary, and assures us, That the confession then required and in use, was publique, and before the Church, and that your auricular Confession was not then in the world; for which his mouth is stopped by your *Index Expurgatorious.* 2. That your brother *Arcudius* acknowledges, that the Eucharist was in *Cyprians* time given to Infants, and esteemed necessary, or at least profitable for them, and the giving it shews no less; and now I would know, whether you will acknowledge your Church bound to give it, and to esteem so of it? 3. That it might be then commanded, and being commanded, be thought necessary, and yet be but a Church-Constitution. Neither will I deny, if the present Church, could, and would so order it, that the abuses of it might be prevented, and conceiving it profitable, should enjoyn the use of it, but that being commanded it would be necessary. 4. Concerning our Ordinations, besides that I have proved it impossible that they should be so doubtful as yours, according to your own principles; I answer, that experience shews them certainly sufficient to bring men to faith and repentance, and consequently to salvation; and that if there were any secret defect of any thing necessary, which we cannot help, God will certainly supply it.

16. *Ad §. 6.* In the *sixth*, you say, *you will not repeat, but only put us again in mind that unless the Roman Church were the true Church there was no visible Church upon earth, a thing so manifest that Protestants themselves confesse,*

fess, &c. Answ. Neither will I repeat, but only put you in mind that you have not prov'd that there is any necessity that there should be any true Church in your sense visible; nor if there were, that there was no other besides the *Roman*. For as for the confession of Protestants which here you insist upon, it is evident out of their own words cited by your self, that by the *whole world*, they meant only the *greatest part of it*, which is an usual figure of speech, and never intended to deny that besides the Church then reigning and triumphing in this world, there was an other militant Church, other Christians visible enough though persecuted and oppressed. Nor thirdly do you here make good so much as with one fallacy, that if the *Roman* Church were then the visible Church, it must needs be now the only or the safer way to heaven; and yet the connexion of this consequence was very necessary to be shown. For, for ought I know, it was not impossible that it might then be the only visible Church, and yet now a very dangerous way to heaven, or perhaps none at all.

17. Afterwards you vainly pretend that *all Roman Catholiques, not one excepted, profess, that protestancy unrepented destroyes salvation*. From which generality we may except two at least to my knowledge, and those are, *your self*, and *Franciscus de Sancta Clara*, who assures us that *Ignorance and Repentante may excuse a Protestant from damnation though dying in his error*. And this is all the Charity, which by your own confession also, the most favourable Protestants allow to Papists; and therefore with strange repugnance to your self you subjoyn, that *these are the men whom we must hold not to erre damnably, unless we will destroy our own Church and Salvation*. Whereas, as I have said before, though you were Turks, and Pagans, we might be good Christians. Neither is it necessary for perpetuating of a Church before *Luther*, that your errors even then should not be *damnable*, but only not *actually damning* to some ignorant souls among you. In vain therefore you do make such tragedies as here you do! In vain you conjure us with *fear and trembling to consider these things!* We have considered them again and again, and lookt upon them on both sides, and find neither terror nor truth in them. Let Children and Fools be terrified with bug-bears, men of understanding will not regard them.

18. *Ad §.* 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Your whole discourse in your *five next Paragraphs*, I have in the beginning of this Chapter fully confuted, by saying, that it stands altogether upon the false foundation of this affected mistake, that *we do and must confess the* Roman *Church free from damnable error*; which will presently be apparent, to any one who considers, that the *seventh and tenth* are nothing but D. *Potter*'s words; and that in the *other three*, you obtrude upon us this *Crambe* no fewer then seven times. May you be pleased to look back to your own Book, and you shall find it so as I have said: and that at least in a hundred other places you make your advantage of this false imputation: which when you have observ'd, and withal considered that your self plainly intimate, that D. *Potter*'s discourses, which here you censure, would be good and concluding, if we did not (as we do not) free you from damnable error; I hope you will acknowledge that my vouchsafing these *Sections* the honour of any farther answer, is a great supererogation in point of civility. Nevertheless partly that I may the more ingratiate my self with you, but especially, that I may stop their mouths who will be apt to say, that every word of yours which I should omit to speak to, is an unanswerable

unanswerable argument, I will hold my purpose of answering them more punctually and particularly.

19. First then, to your little parenthesis, which you interline among D. *Potter's* words, *p. 7. That any small error in faith destroys all faith,* (To omit what hath been said before,) I answer here what is proper for this place: that S. *Austin*, whose authority is here stood upon, thought otherwise: He conceived the Donatists to hold some error in faith, and yet not to have no faith. His words of them to this purpose are most pregnant and evident, *You are with us* (saith he to the Donatists. Ep. 48.) *as Baptism, in the Creed, and the other Sacraments*: And again, *Super gestis cum emerit: Thou hast proved to me that thou hast Faith: prove to me likewise that thou hast Charity*. Parallel to which words are these of *Optatus*, *Amongst us and you is one Ecclesiastical conversation, common lessons, the same faith, the same Sacraments*. Where, by the way, we may observe, that in the judgement of these Fathers, even Donatists, though Hereticques and Schismatiques, gave true Ordination, the true Sacrament of Matrimony, true Sacramental Absolution, Confirmation, the true Sacrament of the Eucharist, true Extream Unction; or else (choose you whether) some of these were not then esteem'd Sacraments. But for Ordination, whether he held it a Sacrament or no, certainly he held that it remain'd with them entire: for so he saies in express terms, in his book against *Parmenianus* his Epistle. Which Doctrin if you can reconcile with the present Doctrin of the *Roman* Church, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo*.

20. Whereas, in the beginning of the 8. Sect. *You deny that your argument drawn from our confessing the possibility of your Salvation, is for simple people alone, but for all men*: I answer, Certainly whosoever is moved with it, must be so simple as to think this a good and a concluding reason; Some ignorant men in the *Roman* Church may be sav'd, by the confession of Protestants, (which is indeed all that they confess,) therefore it is safe for me to be of the *Roman* Church; and he that does think so, what reason is there why he should not think this as good, Ignorant Protestants may be saved, by the confession of Papists, (by name, Mr. *K.*) therefore it is safe for me to be of the Protestant Church? Whereas you say, that *this your argument is grounded upon an inevitable necessity for us, either to grant Salvation to your Church, or to entail certain damnation upon our own, because ours can have no being till* Luther, *unless yours be supposed to have been the true Church*. I answer, This cause is no cause: For first, as *Luther* had no being before *Luther*, and yet he was when he was, though he was not before; so there is no repugnance in the terms, but that there might be a true Church after *Luther*, though there were none for some ages before; as, since *Columbus* his time, there have been Christians in *America*, though before there were none for many ages. For neither do you shew, neither does it appear, that the generation of Churches is univocal, that nothing but a Church can possibly beget a Church; nor that the present being of a true Church, depends necessarily upon the perpetuity of a Church in all ages; any more than the present being of Peripateticks or Stoicks depends upon a perpetual pedegree of them. For though I at no hand deny the Churches perpetuity, yet I see nothing in your book to make me understand, that the truth of the present depends upon it, nor any thing that can hinder, but that a false Church, (Gods providence over-watching and over-ruling it,) may preserve the

means of confuting their own Heresies, and reducing men to truth, and so raising a true Church, I mean the integrity and the authority of the word of God with men. Thus the Jewes preserve means to make men Christians, and Papists preserve means to make men Protestants, and Protestants (which you say are a false Church) do, as you pretend, preserve means to make men Papists; that is, their own Bibles, out of which you pretend to be able to prove that they are to be Papists. Secondly, you shew not, nor does it appear, that the perpetuity of *the Church* depends on the truth of *yours*. For though you talk vainly, as if you were the only men in the world before *Luther*, yet the world knows that this is but talk, and that there were other Christians besides you, which might have perpetuated the Church though you had not been. Lastly, you shew not, neither doth it appear, that your being acknowledged in some sense a true Church, doth necessarily import, that we must grant Salvation to it, unless by it you understand the ignorant members of it, which is a very unusual *Synechdoche*.

21. Whereas you say, *that Catholiques never granted that the Donatists had a true Church or might be saved*. I answ. S. *Austin* himself granted that those among them, who sought the Truth, being *ready when they found it to correct their error, were not Heretiques, and therefore, notwithstanding their error, might be saved*. And this is all the Charity that Protestants allow to Papists.

22. Whereas you say, that D. *Potter* having cited out of S. *Austin* the words of the Catholiques, *that the Donatists had true Baptism*, when he comes to the contrary words of the Donatists, addes, *No Church, no salvation*! Ans. You wrong D. *Potter*, who pretends not to cite S. *Austins* formal words but only his sense, which in him is compleat and full for that purpose whereto it is alleadged by D. *Potter*. His words are, *Pertilianus dixit, Venite ad Ecclesiam Populi & aufugite Traditores, si perire non vultis: Petilian* saith, *Come to the Church yee people, and flie from the Traditours, if yee will not be damn'd: for, that yee may know that they being guilty, esteem very well of our Faith, Behold I Baptize these whom they have infected, but they receive those whom we have Baptized*. Where it is plain, that *Petilian* by his words makes the Donatists the Church, and excludes the Catholiques from salvation absolutely. And therefore *no Church, no salvation* was not D. *Potter*'s addition, And whereas you say, the *Catholiques never yeeld that among the Donatists there was a true Church and hope of Salvation*: I say, it appears by what I have alledged out of S. *Austin*, that they yeelded both these were among the Donatists, as much as we yeeld them to be among the Papists. As for D. *Potter*'s acknowledgement, that *They maintained an error in the matter and nature of it Heretical*: This proves them but Material Heretiques, whom you do not exclude from possibility of Salvation. So that, all things considered, this argument must be much more forcible from the Donatists against the Catholiques, than from Papists against Protestants, in regard Protestants grant Papists no more hope of salvation than Papists grant Protestants: whereas the Donatists excluded absolutely all but their own Part from hope of Salvation, so farre as to acount them no Christians that were not of it: the Catholiques mean while accounting them Brethren, and freeing those among them, from the imputation of Heresie, who being in error *quærebant cautâ sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati cùm invenerint*.

23. Whereas

23. Whereas you say, *That the Argument for the certainty of their Baptism (because it was confessed good by Catholiques, whereas the Baptism of Catholiques was not confessed by them to be good,) is not so good as yours, touching the certainty of your salvation grounded on the confession of Protestants; because we confess there is no damnable error in the Doctrin or practice of the* Roman *Church*: I Ans. No: we confess no such matter, and though you say so a hundred times, no repetition will make it true. We profess plainly, that many damnable errors, plainly repugnant to the precepts of Christ both Ceremonial and Moral, more plainly than this of Rebaptization, and therefore more damnable, are believed and professed by you. And therefore, seeing this is the only disparity you can devise, and this is vanished, it remains that as good an Answer as the Catholiques made touching the certainty of their Baptism, as good may we make, and with much more evidence of Reason, touching the security and certainty of our Salvation.

24. By the way, I desire to be inform'd, seeing you affirm that *Rebaptizing those whom Hereticks had baptized was a sacrilege, and a profession of a damnable Heresie*, When it began to be so? If from the beginning it were so, then was *Cyprian* a sacrilegious professor of a damnable heresie, and yet a Saint and a Martyr. If it were not so, then did your Church excommunicate *Firmilian* and others, and separate from them without sufficient ground of Excommunication or Separation, which is Schismatical. You see what difficulties you run into, on both sides; choose whether you will, but certainly both can hardly be avoided.

25. Whereas again in this 9. you obtrude upon us, *That we cannot but confess that your Doctrin contains no damnable error, and that yours is so certainly a true Church, that unless yours be true we cannot pretend any*: I answer, there is in this neither truth nor modesty to outface us, that we cannot but confess what indeed we cannot but deny. For my part, if I were upon the rack, I perswade my self I should not confess the one nor the other.

26 Whereas again presently you add, that *D.* Potter *grants we should be guilty of Schism, if we did cut off your Church from the body of Christ & the hope of Salvation*: I have shewed above, that he grants no such matter. He saies indeed, *that our not doing so frees us from the imputation of Schism*, and from hence you sophistically inferre, that he *must grant*, *If we did so, we were Schismatiques*, and then make your Reader believe, that this is D. *Potter's* confession, it being indeed your own collection. For as every one that is not a Papist, is not a Jesuit: and yet not every one that is a Papist is a Jesuit: As, whosoever comes not into *England*, comes not to *London*, and yet many may come into *England*, and not come to *London*: As, whosoever is not a man, is not a King, and yet many are men that are not Kings: So likewise it may be certain, that whosoever does not so is free from Schism, and yet they that do so (if there be sufficient cause), may be not guilty of it.

27. Whereas you *pretend to wonder that the Doctor did not answer the argument of the Donatists, which he saies is all one with yours, but referres you to Saint* Austine *there to read it, as if every one carried with him a Librarie, or were able to examine the places in Saint* Austine: I answer, The parity of the Arguments was that which the Doctor was to declare, whereto it was impertinent what the answer was: But sufficient it was to shew that the Donatists argument which you would never grant good,

was yet as good as yours, and therefore yours could not be good. Now to this purpoſe as the concealing the anſwer was no way advantageous, ſo to produce it was not neceſſary; and therefore he did you more ſervice then he was bound to, in referring you to St. *Auſtin* for an anſwer to it. Whereas you ſay, *he had reaſon to conceal it, becauſe it makes directly againſt himſelf*: I ſay, it is ſo farre from doing ſo, that it will ſerve in proportion to the argument, as fitly as if it had been made for it: for, as Saint *Auſtin* ſaies, *that Catholiques approve the Doctrin of Donatiſts, but abhorre their Hereſie of Re-baptization*: ſo we ſay, that we approve thoſe fundamental and ſimple neceſſary Truths which you retain, by which ſome good ſouls among you may be ſaved, but abhorre your many Superſtitions and Hereſies. And as he ſaies that as Gold is good, yet ought not to be ſought for among a company of Theeves; and Baptiſm good, but not to be ſought for in the Conventicles of Donatiſts: ſo ſay we, that the Truths you retain are good, and as we hope ſufficient to bring good ignorant ſouls among you to ſalvation, yet are not to be ſought for in the Conventicles of Papiſts, who hold with them a mixture of many vanities, and many impieties. For, *as for our freeing you from damnable Hereſy, and yeelding you Salvation*, (which ſtone here again you ſtumble at,) neither he nor any other Proteſtant is guilty of it; and therefore you muſt confeſs that this very anſwer will ſerve Proteſtants againſt this charm of Papiſts, as well as Saint *Auſtin* againſt the Donatiſts, and that indeed it was not Doctor *Potter* but *You*, that, without a Sarcaſm, *had reaſon to conceal* it.

28. The laſt piece of D. *Potter*'s book, which you are pleaſed to take notice of in this *firſt Part* of yours, is an argument he makes in your behalfe p. 79. of his book, where he makes you ſpeak thus, *If Proteſtants believe the Religion of Papiſts to be a ſafe way to heaven, why do they not follow it?* This argument you like not, becauſe *many things may be good and yet not neceſſary to be embraced by every body*, and therefore ſcoffe at it, and call it an *argument of his own, a wiſe argument, a wiſe demand*: and then aske of him, what he thinks of it being fram'd thus, *Our Religion is ſafe even by your confeſſion, and therefore you ought to grant that all may embrace it.* And yet farther thus, *Among different Religions one only can be ſafe: But yours by our own confeſſion is ſafe; whereas you hold that in ours there is no hope of ſalvation; therefore we ought to embrace yours.* Anſ. I have adviſed with him, and am to tell you from him, that he thinks reaſonable well of the arguments, but very ill of him that makes them, as affirming ſo often without ſhame and conſcience, what he cannot but know to be plainly falſe: and his reaſon is, becauſe he is ſo far from confeſſing, or giving you any ground to pretend he does confeſs, *that your Religion is ſafe for all that are of it*, from whence only it will follow that all may ſafely embrace it, that in this very place, from which you take theſe words, he profeſſeth plainly, *that it is extreamly dangerous if not certainly damnable to all ſuch as profeſs it, when either they do, or, if their hearts were upright and not perverſly obſtinate, might believe the contrary, and that for us who are convinc'd in conſcience that ſhe* (*the* Roman *Church*) *errs in many things, it lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe errors.* And though here you take upon you a ſhew of great rigour, and will ſeem to hold *that in our way there is no hope of Salvation*; yet formerly you have been more liberal of your Charity towards us, and will needs vye and contend with Doctor *Potter*, Which of *the two ſhall*

be

be more Charitable, assuring us that *you allow Protestants as much Charity as D. Potter spares you, for whom he makes Ignorance the best hope of Salvation.* And now I appeal to any indifferent reader, whether our disavowing to confess you free from damnable error, were not (as I pretend) a full confutation of all that you say in these *five foregoing Paragraphs:* And as for you I wonder, what answer, what evasion, what shift you can devise to cleer your self from dishonesty, for imputing to him almost a hundred times, this acknowledgement which he never makes, but very often, and that so plainly that you take notice of it, professeth the contrary!

29. The best defence that possibly can be made for you, I conceive, is this, that you were led into this error, by mistaking a supposition of a confession, for a confession; a Rhetorical concession of the Doctors for a positive assertion. He saies indeed of your errors, *Though of themselves they be not damnable to them which believe as they profess, yet for us to profess what we believe not, were without question damnable.* But to say, *Though your errors be not damnable, we may not profess them*, is not to say your errors are not damnable, but *only though they be not.* As if you should say, though the Church erre in points not fundamental, yet you may not separate from it: Or, though we do erre in believing Christ really present, yet our error frees us from Idolatry: Or, as if a Protestant should say, Though you do not commit Idolatry in adoring the Host, yet being uncertain of the Priests Intention to consecrate, at least you expose your self to the danger of it: I presume you would not think it fairly done, if any man should interpret either this last speech as an acknowledgement, that you do not commit Idolatry, or the former as confessions, that you do erre in points not fundamental, that you do erre in believing the real presence. And therefore you ought not so to have mistaken D. *Potter*'s words, as if he had confessed the errors of your Church not damnable, when he saies no more but this, *though they be so*, or, suppose, or put the case they be so, yet being errors, we that know them may not profess them to be divine truths. Yet this mistake might have been pardonable, had not Doctor *Potter* in many places of his book, by declaring his judgement touching the quality and malignity of your errors, taken away from you all occasion of error. But now that he saies plainly, *That your Church hath many wayes played the Harlot, and in that regard, deserv'd a Bill of divorce from Christ, and the detestation of Christians, page* 11. *That for that Mass of errors and abuses in judgement and practice which is proper to her, and wherein she differs from us, we judge a reconciliation impossible, and to us (who are convicted in conscience of her corruptions) damnable, page* 20. *That popery is the contagion or plague of the Church, page* 60. *That we cannot, we dare not communicate with her in her publique Liturgy, which is manifestly polluted with gross Superstition. page* 68. *That they who in former ages dyed in the Church of* Rome, *dyed in many sinfull errors, page* 78. *That they that have understanding and means to discover their errors and neglect to use them, he dares not flatter them with so easie a censure, as to give them hope of salvation, page* 79. *That the way of the* Roman *Religion is not safe, but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable, to such as profess it, when they believe (or, if their hearts were upright and not perversely obstinate, might believe) the contrary, p.* 79. *That your Church is but (in some sense) a true Church: and your errors,*

rors only to ſome men not damnable, and that we who are convinc'd in conſcience that ſhe errs in many things are, under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe errors. Seeing, I ſay, he ſaies all this ſo plainly and ſo frequently; certainly your charging him falſely with this acknowledgement, and building a great part not only of your diſcourſe in this Chapter, but of your whole book upon it, poſſibly it may be palliated with ſome excuſe, but it can no way be defended with any luſt apologie. Eſpecially ſeeing you your ſelf more than once or twice, take notice of theſe his ſeverer cenſures of your Church, and the errors of it, and make your advantage of them. In the firſt number of your firſt Chapter, you ſet down three of the former places; and from thence inferre, That *as you affirm Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes Salvation, ſo D.* Potter *pronounces the like heavy doom againſt* Roman *Catholiques:* And again §. 4. of the ſame chapter, *We allow Proteſtants as much charity as D.* Potter *ſpares us, for whom he makes ignorance the beſt hope of ſalvation.* And c. 5. §. 41. you have theſe words: *It is very ſtrange that you judge us extreamly uncharitable in ſaying Proteſtants cannot be ſaved, while your ſelf avouch the ſame of all Learned Catholiques, whom Ignorance cannot excuſe!* Thus out of the ſame mouth you blow hot and cold; and one while, when it is for your purpoſe, you profeſs *D.* Potter *cenſures your errors as heavily as you do ours*; which is very true, for he gives hope of Salvation to none among you, but to thoſe whoſe ignorance was the cauſe of their error, and no ſin cauſe of their ignorance: and preſently after, when another project comes in your head, you make his words ſofter than oile towards you: you pretend he does and muſt confeſs, *That your doctrin contains no damnable error, that your Church is certainly a true Church, that your way to heaven is a ſafe way*, and all theſe acknowledgments you ſet down ſimple and abſolute, without any reſtriction or limitation; whereas in the Doctor they are all ſo qualified, that no knowing Papiſt can promiſe himſelf any ſecurity or comfort from them. *We confeſs* (ſaith he) *the Church of Rome to be (in ſome ſenſe) a true Church, and her errors (to ſome men) not damnable: we believe her Religion ſafe, that is, by Gods great mercy not damnable, to ſome ſuch as believe what they profeſs: But we believe it not ſafe, but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable to ſuch as profeſs it, when they believe (or if their hearts were upright and not perverſly obſtinate might believe) the contrary.* Obſerve, I pray you, theſe reſtraining terms which formerly you have diſſembled, *A true Church in ſome ſenſe, not damnable to ſome men, a ſafe way, that is, by Gods great mercy, not damnable to ſome:* And then ſeeing you have pretended theſe Confeſſions to be abſolute, which are thus plainly limited, how can you avoid the imputation of an egregious Sophiſter? You quarrel with the Doctor, in the end of your Preface, for uſing in his Book ſuch ambiguous terms as theſe, *in ſome ſort, in ſome ſenſe, in ſome degree:* and deſire him, if *he make any reply, either to forbear them, or to tell you roundly in what ſort, in what ſenſe, in what degree, he underſtands theſe and the like mincing phraſes.* But the truth is, he hath not left them ſo ambiguous and undetermin'd as you pretend; but told you plainly, in what *ſenſe your Church may paſs for a true Church, viz.* in regard we may hope that ſhe retains thoſe truths which are ſimply, abſolutely, and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, which may ſuffice to bring thoſe good ſouls to heaven, who wanted means of diſcovering their errors; this is the charitable conſtruction in which you may paſs for

for a Church: And *to what men your Religion may be safe, and your errors not damnable, viz.* to such whom Ignorance may excuse, and therefore he hath more cause to complain of you, for quoting his words without those qualifications, than you to find fault with him for using of them.

30. That your Discourse in the 12 §. presseth you as forcibly as Protestants, I have shewed above: I add here, 1. Whereas you say, that *faith, according to your rigid Calvinists, is either so strong, that once had, it can never be lost; or so more than weak, and so much nothing, that it can never be gotten*: That these are words without sense. Never any Calvinist affirmed that faith was so weak, and so much nothing, that it can never be gotten: but it seems you wanted matter to make up your Antithesis, and therefore were resolved to speak empty words, rather than lose your figure,

Crimina rasis
Librat in antithetis, doctas posuisse Figuras
Laudatur.

2. That there is no Calvinist that will deny the Truth of this Proposition, *Christ died for all*; nor to subscribe to that sense of it, which your Dominicans put upon it; neither can you, with coherence to the received Doctrin of your own Society, deny that they as well as the Calvinists, take away the distinction of sufficient and effectual grace, and indeed hold none to be sufficient, but only that which is effectual. 3. Whereas you say, *They cannot make their calling certain by good works, who do certainly believe that before any good works they are justified, and justified by faith alone, and by that faith whereby they certainly believe they are justified*: I answ. There is no Protestant but believes that Faith, Repentance, and universal Obedience, are necessary to the obtaining of Gods favour and eternal happiness. This being granted, the rest is but a speculative Controversie, a Question about words which would quickly vanish, but that men affect not to understand one another. As if a company of Physitians were in consultation, and should all agree, that three medicines and no more were necessary for the recovery of the Patients health, this were sufficient for his direction towards the recovery of his health; though concerning the proper and specifical effects of these three medicines, there should be amongst them as many differences as men: So likewise being generally at accord that these three things, Faith, Hope, and Charity, are necessary to salvation, so that whosoever wants any of them, cannot obtain it, and he which hath them all cannot fail of it, is it not very evident that they are sufficiently agreed for mens directions to eternal Salvation? And seeing Charity is a full comprehension of all good workes, they requiring Charity as a necessary qualification in him that will be saved, what sense is there in saying, *they cannot make their calling certain by good works?* They know what salvation is as well as you, and have as much reason to desire it: They believe it as heartily as you, that there is no good work but shall have its proper reward, and that there is no possibility of obtaining the eternal reward without good works: and why then may not this Doctrin be a sufficient incitement and provocation unto good works?

31. You say, that *they certainly believe that before any good works they are justified*: But this is a calumny. There is no Protestant but requires to Justification, Remission of sins, and to Remission of sins they all require Repentance, and Repentance I presume may not be denyed the name of a good work; being indeed, if it be rightly understood, and according to the sense of the word in Scripture, an effectual conversion from all sin to all holiness. But though it be taken for meer Sorrow for sins past, and a bare Purpose of amendment, yet even this is a good work; and therefore Protestants requiring this to Remission of sins, and Remission of sins to Justification, cannot with candor be pretended to believe, that they are justified before any good work.

32. You say, *They believe themselves justified by faith alone, and that by that faith whereby they believe themselves justified*: Some peradventure do so, but withal they believe that that faith which is alone, and unaccompanied with *sincere* and universal obedience, is to be esteem'd not faith but presumption, and is at no hand sufficient to justification: that though Charity be not imputed unto justification, yet is it required as a necessary disposition in the person to be justified, and that though in regard of the imperfection of it, no man can be justified by it, yet that, on the other side, no man can be justified without it. So that upon the whole matter, a man may truly and safely say, that the Doctrin of these Protestants, taken altogether, is not a Doctrin of Liberty, not a Doctrin that turns hope into presumtion and carnal security: though it may justly be feared, that many licentious persons, taking it by halfes, have made this wicked use of it. For my part, I do heartily wish, that by publique Authority it were so ordered, that no man should ever preach or print this Doctrin that Faith alone justifies, unless he joyns this together with it, that Universal Obedience is necessary to salvation. And besides that those Chapters of Saint *Paul* which intreat of justification by faith, without the works of the Law, were never read in the Church, but when the 13. Chapter of the 1. Epistle to the *Corinth.* concerning the absolute necessity of Charity should be, to prevent misprision, read together with them.

33. Whereas you say, that *some Protestants do expresly affirm the former point to be the soul of the Church*, &c. *and therefore they must want the Theological vertue of Hope, and that none can have true hope, while they hope to be saved in their communion.* I answ. They have great reason to believe the Doctrin of justification, by faith only, a point of great weight and importance, if it be rightly understood: that is, they have reason to esteem it a principal and necessary duty of a Christian, to place his hope of justification and salvation, not in the perfection of his own righteousness (which if it be imperfect will not justifie, but only in the mercies of God through Christs satisfaction; and yet, notwithstanding this, nay the rather for this, may preserve themselves in the right temper of good Christians, which is a happy mixture and sweet composition of confidence and fear. If this Doctrin be otherwise expounded than I have here expounded, I will not undertake the justification of it: only I will say (that which I may do truly) that I never knew any Protestant such a soli fidian, but that he did believe these divine truths: *That he must make his calling certain by good works: That he must work out his salvation with Fear and Trembling, and that while he does not so, he can have no well grounded hope of Salvation:*

I say

I say, I never met with any who did not believe these divine Truths, and that with a more firm, and a more unshaken assent, than he does that himself is predestinate, and that he is justified by believing himself justified. I never met with any such, who if he saw there were a necessity to do either, would not rather forgoe his belief of these Doctrins, than the former: these which he sees disputed and contradicted and opposed with a great multitude of very potent Arguments; than those, which being the expres words of Scripture whosoever should call into question, could not with any modesty pretend to the title of Christian. And therefore, there is no reason but we may believe, that their full assurance of the former Doctrin, doth very well qualifie their perswasion of the later: and that the former (as also the lives of may of them do sufficien ly testifie) are more effectual to temper their hope, and to keep it at a stay of a filial and modest assurance of Gods favour, built upon the conscience of his love and fear, than the later can be to swell and puffe them up into vain confidence and ungrounded presumption This reason joyn'd with our experience of the honest and religious conversation of many men of this opinion, is a sufficient ground for Charity, to hope well of their Hope: and to assure our selves, that it cannot be offensive, but rather most acceptable to God, if, notwithstanding this diversity of opinion, we embrace each other with the strict embraces of love and communion. To you and your Church we leave it, to separate Christians from the Church, and to proscribe them from heaven upon trivial and trifling causes: As for our selves, we conceive a charitable judgement of our Brethren and their errors, though untrue, much more pleasing to God than a true judgement, if it be uncharitable; and therefore shall alwayes choose (if we do err) to err on the milder and more merciful part, and rather to retain those in our Communion which deserve to be ejected, than eject those that deserve to be retain'd.

34. Lastly, whereas you say, that *seeing Protestants differ about the point of Justification, you must needs inferre that they want Unity in faith, and consequently all faith, and then that they cannot agree what points are fundamentall*; I answer, to the first of these inferences, that, as well might you inferre it upon *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* and *Polycrates*; upon *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* and Saint *Cyprian*: in asmuch as it is undeniably evident that what one of those esteemed necessary to salvation the other esteemed not so. But points of Doctrin (as all other things) are as they are, and not as they are esteemed: neither can a necessary point be made unnecessary by being so accounted, nor an unnecessary point be made necessary by being overvalued. But as the ancient Philosophers, (whose different opinions about the Soule of man you may read in *Aristotle de anima*, and *Cicero's Tusculan Questions*,) notwithstanding their divers opinions touching the nature of the soule, yet all of them had soules, and soules of the same nature: Or as those Physitians who dispute whether the Brain or Heart be the principall part of a man, yet all of them have brains and have hearts, and herein agree sufficiently: So likewise, though some Protestants esteem that Doctrine the soule of the Church, which others do not so highly value, yet this hinders not but that which is indeed the soule of the Church may be in both sorts of them: And though one account that a necessary truth which others account neither necessary nor perhaps true; yet, this notwithstanding, in those truths which

are

are truly and really necessary they may all agree. For no Argument can be more sophistical than this; They differ in some points which they esteem necessary; Therefore they differ in some that indeed and in truth are so.

35. Now as concerning the other Inference, *That they cannot agree what points are fundamental:* I have said and prov'd formerly that there is no such necessity as you imagine or pretend, that men should certainly know what is, and what is not fundamental. They that believe all things plainly delivered in Scripture, believe all things fundamental, and are at sufficient Unity in matters of Faith, though they cannot precisely and exactly distinguish between what is fundamental, and what is profitable: nay though by error they mistake some vain, or perhaps some hurtful, opinions for necessary and fundamental Truths. Besides, I have shewed above, that as Protestants do not agree (for you over-reach in saying, they cannot) touching what points are fundamental; so neither do you agree what points are defin'd and so to be accounted, and what are not: nay, nor concerning the subject in which God hath placed this pretended Authority of defining: some of you setling it in the Pope himself, though alone without a Councel, Others in a Councel, though divided from the Pope: Others only in the conjunction of Councel and Pope: Others not in this neither, but in the acceptation of the present Church Universal: Lastly, others not attributing it to this neither, but only to the perpetual Succession of the Church of all ages: of which divided Company, it is very evident and undeniable, that every former may be and are obliged to hold many things defin'd and therefore necessary, which the latter, according to their own gronnds, have no obligation to do, nay cannot do so upon any firm and sure and infallible foundation.

c. 3. Sect. 54. & alibi.

THE

THE CONCLUSION.

AND thus, by God's assistance, and the advantage of a good cause, I am at length, through a passage rather tyring than difficult, arriv'd at the end of my undertaken Voyage; and have, as I suppose, made appear, to all dis-interessed and unprejudicate Readers, what in the beginning I undertook, that a vein of Sophistry and Calumny runs clean through this first part of your Book: wherein though I never thought of the *directions* you have been pleas'd to give me in your Pamphlet entituled *A direction to N. N.* yet upon consideration of my Answer, I find that I have proceeded, as if I had had it alwayes before my eyes, and steer'd my course by it as by a card and compass.

For first, *I have not proceeded by a meer destructive way* (as you call it) *nor objected such difficulties against your Religion, as, upon examination, tend to the overthrow of all Religion*, but have shewed that the truth of Christianity is cleerly independent upon the truth of Popery: and that on the other side, the arguments you urge, and the courses you take, for the maintenance of your Religion, do manifestly tend (if they be closely and consequently followed) to the destruction of all Religion, and lead men by the hand to Atheism and Impiety; whereof I have given you ocular demonstrations in divers places of my book, but especially, in my answer to your *Direction to N. N.*

Neither can I *discover any repugnance between any one part of my answer and any other*, though I have used many more judicious and more searching eyes than mine own to make, if it were possible, such a discovery: and therefore am in good hope, that, though the musick I have made be but dull and flat, and even downright plain-song, even your curious and critical ears shall discover no discord in it; but on the other side, I have charg'd you frequently, and very justly, with manifest contradiction and retractation of your own assertions, and not seldom of the main grounds you build upon, and the principal conclusions which you endeavour to maintain: which I conceive my self to have made apparent even to the eye, c. 2. §. 5. c. 3. §. 88. c. 4. §. 14. and 24. c. 5. §. 93. c. 6. §. 6, 7, 12, 17. c. 7. §. 29. and in many other parts of my Answer.

And though I did never pretend to defend D. *Potter* absolutely and in all things, but only so farre as he defends Truth; (neither did D. *Potter* desire me, nor any law of God or man oblige me, to defend him any farther) yet I do not find that I have cause to differ from him in any matter of moment: particularly, *not concerning the infallibility of God's Church*, which I grant with him to be infallible in fundamentals, because if it should erre in fundamentals, it were not the Church: *Nor concerning the supernaturality of Faith*, which I know and believe as well as you, *to be the gift of God*, and *that flesh and bloud reveal'd it not unto us, but our Father which is in heaven.* But now if it were demanded, What defence you can make for deserting *Charity Mistaken*, in the main Question disputed between

between him and Dr. *Potter*, *Whether Proteſtancy, without a particular repentance and dereliction of it, deſtroy Salvation*, whereof I have convinc'd you? I believe your anſwer would be much like that which *Ulyſſes* makes in the Metamorphoſis for his running away from his friend *Neſtor*, that is, none at all.

For *Oppoſing the Articles of the Church of England*, the Approbation, I preſume, cleers my Book from this imputation.

And whereas you give me a Caution, *that my grounds deſtroy not the belief of diverſe Doctrins which all good Chriſtians believe, yea and of all verities that cannot be prov'd by natural reaſon:* I profeſs ſincerely, that I do not know nor believe, that any ground laid by me in my whole Book, is any way inconſiſtent with any one ſuch Doctrin, or with any verity revealed in the Word of God, though never ſo improbable or incomprehenſible to Natural Reaſon: and if I thought there were, I would deal with it, as thoſe primitive Converts dealt with their curious Books in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*.

For the Epiſtle of St. *James*, *and thoſe other Books which were anciently controverted, and are now received by the Church of* England *as Canonical*; I am ſo far from relying upon any Principles which muſt (to my apprehenſion) bring with them the denial of the authority of them, that I my ſelf believe them all to be Canonical.

For the *overthrowing the Infallibility of all Scripture*, my Book is ſo innocent of it that the Infallibility of Scripture is the chiefeſt of all my grounds.

And laſtly, for Arguments *tending to prove an impoßibility of all Divine, Supernatural, Infallible Faith and Religion*, I aſſure my ſelf, that if you were ten times more a Spider than you are, you could ſuck no ſuch poyſon from them. My heart, I am ſure, is innocent of any ſuch intention: and the Searcher of all hearts knows, that I had no other end in writing this Book, but to confirm to the uttermoſt of my ability, the truth of the Divine and Infallible Religion of our deareſt Lord and Saviour Chriſt Jeſus, which I am ready to ſeal and confirm, not with my Arguments only, but my Bloud!

Now theſe are the Directions which you have been pleas'd to give me, whether out of a fear that I might otherwiſe deviate from them, or out of a deſire to make others think ſo: But howſoever, I have not, to my underſtanding, ſwarved from them in any thing, which puts me in good hope, that my Anſwer to this firſt Part of your Book will give even to you your ſelf indifferent good ſatisfaction.

I have alſo provided, though this were more than I undertook, a juſt and punctual examination and refutation of your *ſecond Part*: But (if you will give your conſent) I am reſolv'd to ſuppreſs it, and that for divers ſufficient and reaſonable conſiderations.

Firſt, becauſe the diſcuſſion of the Controverſies intreated of in the *firſt Part* (if we ſhall think fit to proceed in it, as I for my part ſhall, ſo long as I have truth to reply,) will, I conceive, be ſufficient employment for us, though we caſt off the burden of thoſe many leſſer diſputes which remain behind in the Second. And perhaps we may do God and his Church more ſervice by exactly diſcuſſing and fully clearing the truth in theſe few, than by handling many after a ſleight and perfunctory manner.

Secondly,

Secondly, becauſe the addition of the Second Part, whether for your purpoſe or mine, is clearly unneceſſary: there being no underſtanding man, Papiſt or Proteſtant, but will confeſs, that (for as much as concerns the main queſtion now in agitation, about the ſaveableneſs of Proteſtants) if the firſt part of your Book be anſwered, there needs no reply to the Second: as on the other ſide, I ſhall willingly grant, if I have not anſwered the Firſt, I cannot anſwer a great part of the Second.

Thirdly, becauſe the addition of the Second not only is unneceſſary, but in effect by your ſelf confeſs'd to be ſo. For in your preamble to your Second Part you tell us, *That the ſubſtance of the preſent Controverſie is handled in the firſt: and therein alſo you pretend to have anſwered the chief grounds of D.* Potters *book*: So that in replying to your Second Part, I ſhall do little elſe but purſue ſhadows.

Fourthly, becauſe your Second Part (ſetting aſide Repetitions and References) is in a manner made up of Diſputes about particular matters, which you are very importunate to have forborn, as ſuſpecting, at leaſt pretending to ſuſpect, that they *were brought in purpoſely by D.* Potter *to dazle the Reader's eyes and diſtract his mind, that he might not ſee the clearneſs of the reaſons brought in defence of the General Doctrin delivered in Charity Miſtaken*. All which you are likely enough (if there be occaſion) to ſay again to me; and therefore I am reſolv'd for once even to humour you ſo farre as to keep my diſcourſe within thoſe very liſts and limits which your ſelf have preſcrib'd, and to deal with you upon no other arguments, but only thoſe wherein you conceive your chief advantage and principal ſtrength, and, as it were, your *Sampſon*'s lock to lye: wherein if I gain the cauſe clearly from you (as I verily hope by Gods help I ſhall do) it cannot but redound much to the honour of the truth maintain'd by me, which by ſo weak a Champion can overcome ſuch an *Achilles* for error, even in his ſtrongeſt holds.

For theſe reaſons, although I have made ready an anſwer to your Second Part, and therein have made it ſufficiently evident: That for ſhifting evaſions from D. *Potter*'s arguments: for impertinent cavills, and frivolous exceptions, and injurious calumnies againſt him for his miſalleadging of Authors: For proceeding upon falſe and ungrounded principles; for making inconſequent and ſophiſtical deductions, and, in a word, for all the vertues of an ill anſwer your Second Part is no way ſecond to the firſt: Yet notwithſtanding all this advantage, I am reſolv'd, if you will give me leave, either wholly to ſuppreſs it, or at leaſt to deferre the publication of it untill I ſee what exceptions, upon a twelve-months examination (for ſo long I am well aſſur'd you have had it in your hands) you can take at this which is now publiſhed, that ſo if my grounds be diſcovered falſe I may give over building on them: or (if it ſhall be thought fit) build on more ſecurely when it ſhall appear that nothing material and of moment, is or can be objected againſt them. This I ſay, upon a ſuppoſition that your ſelf will allow theſe reaſons for ſatisfying and ſufficient, and not repent of the motion which your ſelf has made, of reducing the Controverſie between us to this ſhort Iſſue. But in caſe your minde be altered, upon the leaſt intimation you ſhall give me, that you do but deſire to have it out, your deſire ſhall prevail with me above all otherr eaſons, and you ſhall not fail to receive it with all convenient ſpeed.

Only

Only that my Answer may be compleat, and that I may have all my work together, and not be troubled my self, nor enforc'd to trouble you, with after-reckonings, I would first entreat you to make good your Promise of not *omitting to answer all the particles of* D. Potters *book, which may any way import*, and now at least to take notice of some (as it seems to me) not unconsiderable passages of it, which between your first and second Part, as it were between two stools, have been suffer'd hitherto to fall to the ground, and not been vouchsaf'd any answer at all.

For after this neglectful fashion you have passed by in silence, First, his discourse, wherein he proves briefly, but very effectually, that *Protestants may be sav'd, and that the Roman Church, especially the Jesuits are very uncharitable. S.* 1. *p.* 6,7,8 9. Secondly, the authorities whereby he justifies, That *the ancient Fathers, by the Roman understood alwayes a particular, and never the Catholique Church*: to which purpose he alleageth the words of *Ignatius, Ambrose, Innocentius, Celestine, Nicolaus, S.* 1. *p.* 10. Whereunto you say nothing, neither do you infringe his Observation with any one Instance to the contrary.

Thirdly, the greatest and most substantial part of his answers to the Arguments of *Charity Mistaken*, built upon *Deut.* 17. *Numb.* 16. *Mat.* 28. 20. *Mat.* 18. 17. and in particular many pregnant and convincing Texts of Scripture, quoted in the margent of his book, *p.* 25. to prove that the Judges of the Synagogue (whose Infallibility yet you make an Argument of yours, and therefore must be more credible then yours) are vainly pretended to have been infallible: but as they were oblig'd to judge according to the Law, so were obnoxious to deviations from it. *S.* 2. *p.* 23, 24,25, 26, 27.

Fourthly, his discourse wherein he shewes the difference between the Prayers for the dead used by the Ancients, and those now in use in the *Roman* Church.

Fifthly, the Authority of three Ancient, and above twenty modern Doctors of your own Church alleadg'd by him, to shew that in their opinion even Pagans, and therefore much more erring Christians (if their lives were morally honest) by Gods extraordinary mercy and Christs merit may be saved. *S.* 2. *p.* 45.

Sixthly, a great part of his discourse whereby he declares that actual and external Communion with the Church is not of absolute necessity to Salvation: nay that those might be saved whom the Church utterly refus'd to admit to her Communion. *S.* 2. *p.* 46, 47, 48, 49.

Seventhly, his discourse concerning the Churches latitude, which hath in it a clear determination of the main Controversie against you: For therein he proves plainly, that all appertain *to the Church, who believe that Jesus* is the Christ the sonne *of God and Saviour of the world with submission to his Doctrin* in mind and will: which he irrefragably demonstrates by many evident Texts of Scripture, containing the substance of his Assertion even in terms. *S.* 4. *p.* 114,115,116,117.

Eighthly, that wherein he shews by many pertinent examples, that *grosse error and true Faith may be lodged together in the* same mind: And that men are not *chargeable with the damnable consequences of their erroneous opinions. S.* 4 *p.* 112.

Ninthly, a very great part of his Chapter touching *the dissentions of the Roman-Church*, which he shews (against the pretences of *Charity Mistaken*)

to

to be no leſs than ours, for the importance of the matter, and the purſuit of them to be exceedingly uncharitable. S. 6. p. 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197.

Tenthly, his clear refutation and juſt reprehenſion of *the Doctrine of implicite Faith, as it is deliver'd by the Doctors of your Church:* which he proves very conſonant to the Doctrin of Heretiques and Infidels, but evidently repugnant to the word of God. *Ibid. p.* 201, 202, 203, 204, 205.

Laſtly, his diſcourſe wherein he ſhews that *it is unlawful for the Church of after Ages to add any thing to the Faith of the Apoſtles:* And many of his Arguments whereby he proves that in the *judgement of the Ancient Church the Apoſtles Creed was eſteem'd a ſufficient ſummary of the neceſſary* Points of ſimple belief, and a great number of great authorities, to juſtifie the Doctrin of the Church of *England* touching the Canon of Scripture, eſpecially the old Teſtament, *S. 7. p.* 221, 223, 228, 229.

All theſe parts of *Doctor Potter's* book, for reaſon beſt known to your ſelf, you have dealt with, as the Prieſt and Levite in the Goſpel did with the wounded *Samaritan*, that is, *only look't upon them and paſs'd by:* But now at leaſt when you are admoniſh't of it, that my Reply to your ſecond part (if you deſire it,) may be perfect, I would entreat you to take them into your conſideration, and to make ſome ſhew of ſaying ſomething to them, leſt otherwiſe the world ſhould interpret your obſtinate ſilence a plain confeſſion that you can ſay nothing.

FINIS.

THE
Apostolical Institution
OF
EPISCOPACY
DEMONSTRATED.

BY

WILL. CHILLINGWORTH
Master of Arts of the
UNIVERSITY *of* OXFORD.



LONDON,
Printed by *E. Cotes* dwelling in *Aldersgate-street*.
Anno Dom. M.DC.LXIV.



THE Apoſtolical Inſtitution OF EPISCOPACY DEMONSTRATED.

Sect. I.

IF we abſtract from *Epiſcopal Government* all accidentals, and conſider only what is eſſential and neceſſary to it; we ſhall finde in it no more but this: An appointment of one man of eminent ſanctity and ſufficiency to have the care of all the Churches, within a certain Precinct or Dioceſs; and furniſhing him with authority (not abſolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by Laws, and moderated by joyning to him a convenient number of aſſiſtants) to the intent that all the Churches under him may be provided of good and able Paſtors: and that both of Paſtors and people, conformity to Laws, and performance of their duties may be required, under penalties, not left to diſcretion, but by Law appointed.

Sect. II.

To this kind of Government, I am not by any particular intereſt ſo devoted, as to think it ought to be maintained, either in oppoſition to Apoſtolick Inſtitution; or to the much deſired reformation of mens lives, and reſtauration of Primitive diſcipline; or to any Law or Precept of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: for that were to maintain a means contrary to the end; for Obedience to our Saviour, is the end for which Church-Government is appointed. But if it may be *demonſtrated* (or made much more probable than the contrary) as I verily think it may: I. That it is

not repugnant to the government ſetled in and for the Church by the Apoſtles. II. That it is as complyable with the Reformation of any evill which we deſire to reform either in Church or State, or the introduction of any good which we deſire to introduce as any other kind of Government: And, III. That there is *no* Law, *no* Record of our Saviour againſt it: Then, I hope, it will not be thought an unreaſonable Motion, if we humbly deſire thoſe that are in Authority, eſpecially the High Court of Parliament, That it may not be ſacrificed to Clamour, or over-born by Violence: and though (which God forbid) the greater part of the Multitude ſhould cry, *Crucifie, Crucifie*; yet our Governours would be ſo full of Juſtice and Courage, as not to give it up, until they perfectly underſtand concerning Epiſcopacy it ſelf, *Quid mali fecit?*

Sect. III.

I ſhall ſpeak at this time only of the firſt of theſe three points: That Epiſcopacy is not repugnant to the Government ſetled in the Church for perpetuity by the Apoſtles. Whereof I conceive this which follows is as clear a Demonſtration, as any thing of this nature is capable of.

That this Government was received univerſally in the Church, either in the Apoſtles time, or preſently after, is ſo evident and unqueſtionable, that the moſt learned adverſaries of this Government do themſelves confeſs it.

Sect. IV.

Petrus Molinæus in his Book *De munere paſtorali*, purpoſely written in defence of the Presbyterial-government, acknowledgeth: *That preſently after the Apoſtles times, or even in their time (as Eccleſiaſtical ſtory witneſſeth) it was ordained, That in every City one of the Presbytery ſhould be called a Biſhop, who ſhould have pre-eminence over his Colleagues; to avoid confuſion which oft times ariſeth out of equality. And truly, this form of Government all Churches every where received.*

Sect. V.

Theodorus Beza in his Tract, *De triplici Epiſcopatûs genere*, confeſſeth in effect the ſame thing. For, having diſtinguiſhed Epiſcopacy into three kinds, *Divine*, *Humane*, and *Satanical*; and attributing to the ſecond (which he calls *Humane*, but we maintain and conceive to be *Apoſtolical*) not only a priority of Order, but a ſuperiority of Power and Authority over other Presbyters, bounded yet by Laws and Canons provided againſt Tyranny: he clearly profeſſeth that of this kind of Epiſcopacy, is to be underſtood whatſoever we read concerning the authority of Biſhops (or Preſidents, as *Juſtin Martyr* calls them) in *Ignatius*, and other more ancient Writers.

Sect. VI.

Certainly, from * these two great Defenders of the Presbytery, we should never have had this free acknowledgement, (so prejudicial to their own pretence, and so advantagious to their adversaries purpose) had not the evidence of clear and undeniable truth enforced them to it. It will not therefore be necessary, to spend any time in confuting that uningenuous assertion of the anonymous Author of the Catalogue of Testimonies, for the equality of Bishops and Presbyters, who affirms, *That their disparity began long after the Apostles times:* But we may safely take for granted that which these two learned Adversaries have confessed; and see, whether upon this foundation laid by them, we may not by unanswerable reason raise this superstructure;

That seeing Episcopal Government is confessedly so Ancient and so Catholique, it cannot with reason be denyed to be Apostolique.

* To whom two others also from *Geneva* may be added: *Daniel Chamierus* (in Panstratia, tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 6. Sect. 24.) and *Nicol. Vedelius* (Exercitat. 3. in epist. Ignatii ad Philadelph. cap. 14. & Exercit. 8. in Epist. ad Mariam, cap. 3.) which is and never *will*) fully also demonstrated in D. *Hammond*'s *Dissertations against Blondel* (which never *were* answered, by the testimonies of those who wrote in the very next Age after the Apostles.

Sect. VII.

For so great a change, as between Presbyterial Government and Episcopal, could not possibly have prevailed all the world over in a little time. Had Episcopal Government been an aberration from (or a corruption of) the Government left in the Churches by the Apostles, it had been very strange, that it should have been received in any *one* Church so suddainly, or that it should have prevailed in *all* for many Ages after. *Variâsse debuerat error Ecclesiarum: quod autem apud omnes unum est, non est erratum, sed traditum. Had the Churches err'd, they would have varied: What therefore is one and the same amongst all, came not sure by error, but tradition.* Thus *Tertullian* argues very probably, from the consent of the Churches of his time, not long after the Apostles, and that in matter of opinion much more subject to unobserv'd alteration. But that in the frame and substance of the necessary Government of the Church, a thing alwayes in use and practice, there should be so suddain a change as presently after the Apostles times; and so universal, as received in all the Churches; this is clearly *impossible.*

Sect. VIII.

For, What universal cause can be assigned or faigned of this *universal* Apostasie? You will not imagine that the Apostles, all or any of them, made any decree for this change, when they were living; or left order for it in any Will or Testament, when they were dying. This were to grant the question; to wit, That the Apostles, being to leave the Government of the Churches themselves, and either seeing by experience, or foreseeing by the Spirit of God, the distractions and disorders, which would arise from a multitude of equals, substituted Episcopal Government instead of their own. General Councels to make a Law for a general change,

for many ages there was none. There was no Chriſtian Emperour, no coercive power over the Church to enforce it. Or, if there had been any, we know no force was equal to the courage of the Chriſtians of thoſe times. Their lives were then at command (for they had not *then* learnt to *fight* for Chriſt) but their obedience to any thing *againſt* his Law was not to be commanded (for they had perfectly learn't to *die* for him.) Therefore there was no power then to command this change; or if there had been any, it had been in vain.

Sect. IX.

What device then ſhall we ſtudy, or to what fountain ſhall we reduce this ſtrange pretended alteration? Can it enter into our hearts to think, that all the Presbyters and other Chriſtians then, being the Apoſtles Schollers, could be generally ignorant of the Will of Chriſt, touching the neceſſity of a Presbyterial Government? Or, dare we adventure to think them ſo ſtrangely wicked all the World over, as againſt knowledge and conſcience to conſpire againſt it? Imagine the ſpirit of *Diotrephes* had entred into ſome, or a great many of the Presbyters, and poſſeſſed them with an ambitious deſire of a forbidden ſuperiority, was it poſſible they ſhould attempt and atchieve it once without any oppoſition or contradiction? and beſides, that the contagion of this ambition, ſhould ſpread it ſelf and prevail without ſtop or controul; nay, without any noiſe or notice taken of it, through all the Churches in the World; all the watchmen in the mean time being ſo faſt aſleep, and all the dogs ſo dumb, that not ſo much as one ſhould open his mouth againſt it?

Sect. X.

But let us ſuppoſe (though it be a horrible untruth) that the Preſbyters and people *then*, were not ſo good *Chriſtians* as the Presbyterians are *now*; that they were generally ſo negligent to retain the government of Chriſt's Church commanded by Chriſt, which we now are ſo zealous to reſtore: yet certainly we muſt not forget nor deny, that they were *men* as we are. And if we look upon them but as meer natural men; yet, knowing by experience, how hard a thing it is, even for Policy arm'd with Power by many attempts and contrivances, and in a long time, to gain upon the liberty of any *one* people; undoubtedly we ſhall never entertain ſo wild an imagination, as that, among all the Chriſtian Presbyteries in the World, neither conſcience of duty, nor love of liberty, nor averſneſs from pride and uſurpation of others over them, ſhould prevail ſo much with any one, as to oppoſe this pretended univerſal invaſion of the Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, and the liberty of Chriſtians.

SECT. XI.

When I shall see therefore all the Fables in the *Metamorphosis* acted and prove Stories; when I shall see all the Democracies and Aristocracies in the World lye down and sleep, and awake into Monarchies: then will I begin to believe that Presbyterial Government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles times, should presently after (against the Apostles doctrine and the will of Christ) be whirl'd about like a scene in a masque, and transformed into Episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and, in humane reason, impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus:

Episcopal Government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the Apostles times.

Between the Apostles times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration.

And therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so Ancient and Catholique, must be granted also to be Apostolique, *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

FINIS.

NINE
SERMONS:

The *First* Preached before His *MAJESTY*

King CHARLES

the *FIRST:*

The other *Eight* upon ſpecial and eminent Occaſions.

BY

WILL. CHILLINGWORTH

Maſter of Arts of the

UNIVERSITY *of* OXFORD.



LONDON,

Printed by *E. Cotes* dwelling in *Alderſgate-ſtreet.*

Anno Dom. M.DC.LXIV.

TO THE
READER.

Christian Reader,

THese Sermons were, by the Godly and Learned Author of them, fitted to the Congregations to which he was to speak; and no doubt intended only for the benefit of Hearers, not of Readers. Nevertheless, it was the desire of many that they might be published, upon the hope of good that might be done to the Church of God by them. There is need of plain Instructions to incite men to holiness of life, as well as accurate Treatises in Points Controverted, to discern Truth from Error. For which end I dare promise these Sermons will make much, where they find an honest and humble Reader. It was the Author's greatest care (as you may find in the reading of them) To handle the Word of God by manifestation of the truth, commending himself to every mans conscience in the sight of God: as once St. Paul pleaded for himself, 2 Cor. 4.2. And if that be the property (which they say) of an eloquent and good speaker, Non ex ore, sed ex pectore, To speak from his heart rather than his tongue; then surely this Author was an excellent Orator, one that spake out of sound understanding with true affection.

How great his parts were, and how well improved, as may appear by these his Labours, so they were fully known, and the loss of them sufficiently bewailed by those among whom he lived and conversed.

Many

Many excellencies *there were in him, for which his* memory remains; *but this above all was his crown,* that he unfeignedly ſought God's glory, and the good of mens ſouls. *It remains, that theſe* Sermons *be* read *by thee with a* care to profit, *and* thanks *to God for the* benefit *thou haſt by them, ſith they are ſuch* talents, *as in the uſe of which he* requires *and* expects *to be* glorified. *Farewell.*

The

The First Sermon.

2 Tim. III. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

This know also, that in the last dayes perilous times shall come.
For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholy,
Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,
Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more then lovers of God;
Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.

TO a discourse upon these words, I cannot think of any fitter Introduction, then that wherewith our Saviour sometime began a Sermon of his, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled.* And I would to God, there were not great occasion to fear, that a great part of it may be fulfilled in this place.

Two things are contained in it. First, the reall wickedness of the generality of the men of the Latter-times, in the four first verses. For by *men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud,* &c. I conceive is ment, men generally shall be so; otherwise this were nothing peculiar to the last, but common to all times: for in all times some, nay many, have been lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud, *&c.* Secondly, we have here the formal and hypocritical godliness of the same times, in the last verse, *Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof*; which latter, ordinarily and naturally accompanies the former. For, as the shadows are longest when the Sun is lowest, and as vines and other fruit-trees bear the less fruit, when they are suffered to luxuriate and spend their sap upon superfluous suckers, and aboundance of leaves: So commonly, we may observe both in Civil conversation, where there is great store of formality, there is little sincerity: and in Religion, where there is a decay of true and cordial piety, there men entertain and please themselves, and vainly hope to please God with ex-

ternal formalities, and performances, and great store of that righteousness for which Christ shall judge the world.

It were no difficult matter to shew that the truth of St. *Paul*'s prediction is by experience justified in both parts of it; but my purpose is to restrain my self to the latter, and to endeavour to clear unto you, that that in our times is generally accomplished: That almost in all places the power of Godliness is decayed and vanished; the form and profession of it only remaining: That the spirit, and soul, and life of Religion, is for the most part gone; only the outward body or carcass, or rather the picture or shadow of it being left behind: This is the Doctrin which at this time I shall deliver to you; and the Use, which I desire most heartily you should make of it, is this, To take care that you confute so far as it concerns your particulars, what I fear I shall prove too true in the general.

To come then to our business, without further complement, let us examine our wayes, and consider impartially, What the Religion of most men is.

We are baptized in our infancy, that is, as I conceive, dedicated and devoted to God's service, by our Parents and the Church, as young *Samuel* was by his Mother *Anna*, and there we take a Solemn Vow, *To forsake the Devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all the covetous desires of it; to forsake also all the carnal desires of the flesh, and not to follow nor be led by them.* This vow we take when we be children and understand it not: and, How many are there, who know, and consider, and regard what they have vowed, when they are become men, almost as little as they did being children: Consider the lives, and publique actions of most men of all conditions, in Court, City, and Country, and then deny it, if you can, that those three things which we have renounced in our Baptism; the profits, honours, and pleasures of the World, are not the very Gods which divide the world amongst them, are not served more devoutly, confided in more heartily, loved more affectionately, then the *Father, Son, and holy Ghost*, in whose name we are baptized? deny, if you can, the dayly and constant imployment of all men, to be either a violent prosecution of the vain pomp and glory of the world, or of the power, riches, and contemptible profits of it, or of the momentary or unsatisfying pleasures of the flesh, or else of the more diabolical humours of pride, malice, revenge, and such like: and yet with this empty form we please and satisfie our selves, as well as if we were lively born again by the Spirit of God, not knowing or not regarding what St. *Peter* hath taught us, That the *Baptism* which must save us, is, 1 Pet. 3. 21. *Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience unto God.*

When we are come to years capable of instruction, many, which is lamentable to consider, are so little regarded by themselves or others, that they continue little better then Pagans in a Common-wealth of Christians, and know little more of God or of Christ, then if they had been bred in the Indies. A lamentable case, and which will one day lye heavy upon their account, which might have amended it and did not. But many, I confess, are taught to act over this play of Religion, and learned to say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*; and, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*: but, Where are the men that live so, as if they did believe in earnest, that God is their Almighty Father? Where are they that fear him, and trust him,

him, and depend upon him only, for their whole happiness, and love him, and obey him, as in reason we ought to do to an Almighty Father? Who, if he be our Father, and we be indeed his children, will do for us all the good he can; and if he be Almighty, can do for us all the good he will; and yet, how few are there, who love him with half that affection as children usually do their Parents, or believe him with half that simplicity, or serve him with half that diligence? And then for the Lords Prayer, the plain truth is, we lye unto God for the most part clean through it, and for want of desiring indeed, what in word we pray for, tell him to his face as many false tales as we make Petitions. For who shews by his endeavours, that he desires heartily that *God's name should be hallowed*; that is, holily and religiously worshipped and adored by all men? That *his kingdom should be advanced and inlarged? That his blessed will should be universally obeyed?* Who shews by his forsaking sin, that he desires so much as he should do the forgiveness of it? Nay who doth not revenge, upon all occasions, the affronts, contempts, and injuries put upon him, and so upon the matter curse himself, as oft as he sayes, *Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us?* How few depend upon God only for their *dayly bread, viz.* the good things of this life, as upon the only giver of them, so as neither to get nor keep any of them, by any means which they know or fear to be offensive unto God? How few desire in earnest to *avoid temptation?* Nay, who almost is there, that takes not the Devils Office out of his hand, and is not himself a tempter both to himself and others? Lastly, who almost is there that desires heartily and above all things so much as the thing deserves, to be delivered from the *greatest evil*, Sin, I mean, and the Anger of God? Now, beloved, this is certain; he that imployes not requisite industry, to obtain what he pretends to desire, does not desire indeed, but only pretends to do so: He that desires not what he prayes for, prayes with tongue only, and not with his heart, indeed does not pray to God, but play and dally with him. And yet this is all which men generally do, and therefore herein also accomplish this prophecy, *Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.*

And this were ill enough, were it in private, but we abuse God Almighty also with our publick and solemn formalities, we make the Church a Stage whereon to act our parts, and play our Pageants; there we make a profession every day of *confessing our sins with humble, lowly, and obedient hearts*, and yet when we have talked after this manner, 20, 30, 40, years together, our hearts for the most part continue as proud, as impenitent, as disobedient, as they were in the beginning. We make great Protestations, *when we assemble and meet together to render thanks to God Almighty, for the benefits received at his hands*; and if this were to be performed with words, with *Hosanna's*, and *Hallelujahs*, and *Gloria Patri's* and Psalms and Hymns, and such like outward matters, peradventure we should do it very sufficiently: but in the mean time with our lives and actions, we provoke the Almighty, and that to his face, with all variety of grievous and bitter provocations; we do dayly and hourly such things as we know, and he hath assured us, to be odious unto him, and contrary to his nature; as any thing in the world is to the nature of any man in the world; and all this upon poor, trifling, trivial, no temptations. If a man whom you had dealt well with, should deal so with you; one whom ye had

redeemed from the *Turkish* slavery, and instated in some indifferent good inheritance, should make you fine Speeches, entertain you with Panegyricks, and have your prayses alwayes in your mouth; but all this while do nothing that pleases you, but upon all occasions, put all affronts and indignities upon you, Would you say, this were a thankful man? Nay, would you not make heaven and earth ring of his unthankfulness, and detest him almost as much for his fair speeches, as his foul actions. Beloved, such is our unthankfulness to our God and Creatour, to our Lord and Saviour; our tongues ingeminate, and cry aloud *Hosanna, Hosanna,* but the lowder voice of our lives and actions is *Crucifie him, Crucifie him*: We Court God Almighty, and complement with him, and profess to esteem his service *perfect freedome*; but if any thing be to be done, much more if any thing be to be suffered for him, here we leave him. We bow the knee before him, and put a reed in his hand, and a Crown upon his head, and cry, *Hail King of the Jews*: But then with our customary sins, we give him gall to eat, and vinegar to drink, we thrust a spear in his side, nail him to the Cross, and crucifie to our selves the Lord of Glory. This is not the office of a friend to bewail a dead friend with vain lamentation. *Sed quæ voluerit meminisse, quæ mandaverit exequi*, to remember what he desires, and execute what he commands; so said a dying *Roman* to his friend, and so say I to you, To be thankful to God is not to say, God be praysed, or, God be thanked, but to remember what he desires, and execute what he commands. To be thankful to God, is certainly to love him, and to love him is to keep his Commandements, so saith our Saviour, *Joh.* 19. *If ye love me, keep my Commandements*: If we do so, we may justly pretend to thankfulness; which, believe me, is not a word, nor to be performed with words; But if we do not so, as generally we do not, our talk of thankfulness is nothing else but meer talk; and we accomplish Saint *Pauls* propheſie herein also: Having a form of thankfulness, but not the reality, not the power of it.

If I should reckon up unto you, how many direct lies every wicked man tels to God Almighty, as often as he sayes Amen, *to this form of godliness*, which our Church hath prescribed; If I should present unto you all our acting of Piety, and playing of Humiliation, and personating of devotion in the Psalms, the Letanies, the Collects, and generally in the whole Service, I should be infinite: And therefore I have thought good to draw a vail over a great part of our Hypocrisie, and to restrain the remainder of our discourse to the contrariety between our profession and performance, only in two things, I mean, *Faith* and *Repentance*.

And first for *Faith*: We profess, and indeed generally, because it is not safe to do otherwise, that we believe the Scripture to be true, and that it contains the plain and only way to infinite and eternal happiness: But if we did generally believe what we do profess, if this were the language of our hearts as well as our tongues, How comes it to pass that the Study of it is so generally neglected?

Let a book that treats of the Philosophers stone, promise never so many mountains of gold, and even the restoring of the golden age again, yet were it not marvail, if few should study it; and the reason is, because few would believe it. But if there were a book extant, and ordinary to be had, as the Bible is, which men did generally believe to contain a plain

and

and easie way for all men to become rich, and to live in health and pleasure, and this worlds happiness, can any man imagine that this book would be unstudied by any man? and why then should I not believe, That if the Scripture were firmly and heartily believed, the certain and only way to happiness, which is perfect and eternal, it would be studied by all men with all diligence? Seeing therefore most Christians are so cold and negligent in the study of it, preferr all other business, all other pleasures before it; is there not great reason to fear, that many who pretend to believe firmly, believe it not at all, or very weakly and faintly? If the General of an Army, or an Embassadour to some Prince or State, were assured by the King his Master, that the transgressing any point of his Commission, should cost him his life; and the exact performance of it, be recompenced with as high a reward as were in the Kings power to bestow upon him: can it be imagined that any man who believes this, and is in his right mind, can be so supinely and studiply negligent of this charge, which so much imports him, as to oversee, through want of care, any one necessary Article, or part of his Commission; especially if it be delivered to him in writing, and at his pleasure to peruse it every day? Certainly this absurd negligence is a thing without example, and such as peradventure will never happen to any sober man to the worlds end: And by the same reason, if we were firmly perswaded, that this Book doth indeed contain that charge and commission, which infinitely more concerns us; it were not in reason possible, but that to such a perswasion, our care and diligence about it, should be in some measure answerable: seeing therefore most of us are so strangely careless, so grosly negligent of it, is there not great reason to fear, that though we have *professors and protestors* in aboundance; yet the faithful, the truly and sincerely faithful, are, in a manner, failed from the children of men. What but this can be the cause that men are so commonly ignorant of so many articles, and particular mandates of it, which yet are as manifest in it, as if they were written with the beams of the Sun? For example; how few of our Ladies and Gentlewomen, do or will understand, that a voluptuous life, is damnable and prohibited to them? Yet St. *Paul* saith so very plainly, *She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* I believe this case divinely regards not the Sex, He would say, *He* as well as *She*, if there had been occasion. How few of the Gallants of our time do or will understand, that it is not lawful for them to be as expensive and costly in apparel, as their means, or perhaps, their credit will extend unto? which is to sacrifice unto vanity, that, which by the law of Christ, is due unto Charity; and yet the same St. *Paul* forbids plainly this excess even to women -- *also let women* (he would have said it much rather to the men) *array themselves in comely apparel, with shamefastness and modesty, not with embroidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly apparel*; and to make our ignorance the more inexcusable, the very same rule is delivered by St. *Peter* also, 1 *Epist.* 3. 3.

1 Tim. 5. 6.

1 Tim. 2. 9.

How few rich men are or will be perswaded, That the law of Christ permits them not to heap up riches for ever, nor perpetually to add house to house, and land to land, though by lawful means, but requires of them thus much Charity at least, that ever while they are providing for their Wives and Children, they should, out of the increase wherewith God blesseth their industry, allot the Poor a just and free proportion? and when they have provided for them in a convenient manner, (such as they

themselves shall judge sufficient and convenient in others) that then they should give over making purchase after purchase, but, with the surplussage of their revenue beyond their expence, procure, as much as lies in them, that no Christian remain miserably poor: few rich men, I fear, are or will be thus perswaded, and their dayly actions shew as much; yet undoubtedly, either our Saviour's general command, *of loving our neighbours as our selves*, which can hardly consist with our keeping vainly, or spending vainly, what he wants for his ordinary subsistence, layes upon us a necessity of this high liberality: or his special command concerning this matter, *Quod superest date pauperibus*; *That which remains give to the poor*: or that which St. *John* saith, 1 *Epist.* 3. 17. reacheth home unto it, *Whosoever hath this worlds good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up the bowels of his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?* which is in effect, as if he had said, He that keepeth from any brother in Christ, that which his brother wants, and he wants not, doth but vainly think that he loves God, and therefore vainly hope that God loves him.

Where almost are the men that are or will be perswaded the Gospel of Christ requires of men *Humility*, like to that of *little Children*, and that under the highest pain of damnation? That is, that we should no more overvalue our selves, or desire to be highly esteemed by others; no more undervalue, scorn, or despise others; no more affect preeminence over others, then little children do, before we have put that pride into them, which afterwards we charge wholly upon their natural corruption: and yet our blessed Saviour requires nothing more rigidly, nor more plainly, than this high degree of humility; *Verily*, saith he, *I say unto you* (he speaks to his Disciples affecting high places, and demanding, which of them should be greatest) *Except ye be converted and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven.*

Would it not be strange news to a great many, that not only *adultery* and *fornication*, but even *uncleanness* and *lasciviousness*; not only *idolatry* and *witchcraft*, but *hatred, variance, emulations, wrath* and *contentions*; not only *murthers*, but *envying*; not *drunkenness* only, but *revelling*, are things prohibited to Christians, and such as if we forsake them not, we cannot inherit the Kingdom of Heaven? and yet these things, as strange as they may seem, are plainly written; some of them by St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 4. *Ch.* but all of them by St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 5. 19. *Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness*, &c. *of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in times past, that they who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*

If I should tell you, that all *bitterness* and *evill speaking* (nay such is the modesty and gravity which Christianity requires of us) *foolish talk and jesting*, are things not allowed to Christians, would not many cry out, These are hard and strange sayings, who can hear them? and yet, as strange as they may seem, they have been written well nigh 1600 years, and are yet extant in very legible Characters, in the Epist. to the *Eph.* the end of the 4 and the beginning of the 5 chap.

To come a little nearer to the business of our times, The chief Actours in this bloudy Tragedy, which is now upon the Stage, who have robb'd our Soveraign Lord the King of his Forts, Towns, Treasure, Ammunition, Houses, of the Persons of many of his Subjects, and (as much as lies in them)

of

of the hearts of all of them: Is it credible that they know, and remember, and consider the example of *David* recorded for their instruction? *Whose heart smote him when he had but cut off the hem of Sauls garment.*

They that make no scruple at all of fighting with his Sacred Majesty, and shooting Muskets and Ordnance at Him (which sure have not the skill, to choose a Subject from a King) to the extream hazard of his Sacred Person, whom by all possible obligations they are bound to defend; do they know, think you, the general rule, without exception or limitation, left by the Holy Ghost for our direction in all such cases, *Who can lift up his hand against the Lords Anointed, and be innocent?* 1 Sam. 26. 9. Or, do they consider his command in the *Proverbs of Solomon*, *My son fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that desire change.* Prov. 24. 21. Or, his counsel in the Book of *Ecclesiastes*, *I counsel thee to keep the Kings Commandement, and that in regard of the Oath of God.* Eccles. 8. 2. Or, because they possibly may pretend that they are exempted from, or unconcerned in, the commands of obedience delivered in the Old Testament, Do they know and remember, the precept given to all Christians by St. *Peter*, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of man, for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as Supream, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him?* Or, that terrible sanction of the same command, *They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation*, left us by St. *Paul* in his *Ep.* to the *Romans*, who then were the miserable Subjects of the worst King, the worst man, nay, I think I may add truly, the worst beast in the world; that so all Rebels mouths might be stopt for ever, and left without all colour or pretence whatsoever, to justifie resistance of Soveraign Power. Undoubtedly, if they did know and consider, and lay close to their hearts, these places of Scripture; or the fearful judgment which befel *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, for this very sin which now they commit, and with a high hand still proceed in, it would be impossible but their hearts would smite them, as *David*'s did, upon an infinitely less occasion, and affright them out of those wayes of present confusion, and eternal damnation. And then on the other side, they that maintain the Kings righteous cause with the hazzard of their lives and fortunes, but by their oaths and curses, by their drunkenness and debauchery, by their irreligion and prophanness, fight more powerfully against their party, then by all other means they do or can fight for it; are not, I fear, very well acquainted with any part of the Bible: but, that strict caution which properly concerns themselves, in the Book of *Leviticus*, I much doubt they have scarce ever heard of it, *When thou goest to warr with thine Enemies, then take heed there be no wicked thing in thee*; not only no wickedness in the cause thou maintainest, nor no wickedness in the means by which thou maintainest it; but no personal impieties in the persons that maintain it. Beloved, for the former two, we have reason to be full of comfort and confidence; For, what is our cause? what is that which you fight, and we pray for? but to deliver the King and all his good Subjects out of the power of their Enemies, who will have no peace but with their slaves and vassals: and for the means by which it is maintained, it is not by lying, it is not by calumnies, it is not by running first our selves, and then forcing the people to universal perjury? but by a just warr, because necessary; and by as fair and merciful a warr, as if they were not Rebels and Traytors you fight against, but Competitours in a doubtful Title. But now for the third part of the caution, that, to deal ingenuously with you,

and

and to deliver my own ſoul; if I cannot other mens, that I cannot think of with half ſo much comfort as the former; but ſeeing ſo many *Jonaſſes* imbarqued in the ſame ſhip, the ſame cauſe with us, and ſo many *Achans* entering into Battle with us againſt the *Cananites*; ſeeing Publicans and ſinners on the one ſide, againſt Scribes and Phariſees on the other; on the one ſide Hypocriſie, on the other Prophaneſs; no honeſty nor juſtice on the one ſide, and very little piety on the other: On the one ſide horrible oaths, curſes, and blaſphemies; on the other, peſtilent lies, calumnies, and perjury: When I ſee amongſt them the pretence of Reformation, if not the deſire, purſued by Antichriſtian, Mahumetan, Devilliſh means; and amongſt us little or no zeal for Reformation of what is indeed amiſs, little or no care to remove the cauſe of God's anger towards us, by juſt, lawfull, and Chriſtian means; I profeſs plainly, I cannot without trembling conſider, what is likely to be the event of theſe Diſtractions; I cannot but fear, that the goodneſs of our cauſe, may ſink under the burthen of our ſins: And that God in his juſtice, becauſe we will not ſuffer his Judgments to atchieve their prime ſcope and intention, which is our amendment and reformation, may either deliver us up to the blind zeal and fury of our Enemies; or elſe, which I rather fear, make us inſtruments of his Juſtice each againſt other, and of our own juſt and deſerved confuſion. This, I profeſs plainly, is my fear, and I would to God it were the fear of every Souldier of his Majeſties Army: but that which encreaſeth my fear is, that I ſee very many of them have very little or none at all: I mean not, that they are fearleſs towards their Enemies, (that's our joy and triumph) but that they ſhew their courage even againſt God, and fear not him, whom it is madneſs not to fear. Now from whence can their not fearing Him proceed, but from their not knowing him, their not knowing his will and their own duty? not knowing how highly it concerns Souldiers, above other profeſsions, to be Religious; and then, if ever, when they are engaged in dangerous adventures, and every moment have their lives in their hands. *When they go to warr with their Enemies, then to take heed there be no wicked thing in them.*

You ſee, Beloved, how many inſtances and examples I have given you of our groſs ignorance of what is neceſſary and eaſie for us to know; and to theſe, it were no difficult matter to add more. Now from whence can this ignorance proceed, but from ſupine negligence? and from whence this negligence, but from our not believing what we pretend to believe? For, did we believe firmly and heartily, that this Book were given us by God for the rule of our Actions, and that obedience to it were the certain and only way to eternal happineſs, it were impoſsible we ſhould be ſuch enemies to our ſelves, ſuch Traytors to our own ſouls, as not to ſearch it, at leaſt, with ſo much diligence, that no neceſſary point of our duty plainly taught in it, could poſsibly eſcape us. But it is certain, and apparent to all the world, that the greateſt part of Chriſtians, through groſs and wilful negligence, remain utterly ignorant of many neceſſary points of their duty to God and Man: and therefore it is much to be feared, that this Book, and the Religion of Chriſt contained in it, among an infinite of profeſſours, labours with great penury of true believers.

It were an eaſie matter (if the time would permit) to preſent unto you many other demonſtrations of the ſame concluſion; but to this drawn

from our willing ignorance of that which is easie and necessary for us to know, I will content my self to add only one more, taken from our voluntary and presumptuous neglect to do those things which we know and acknowledge to be necessary.

If a man should say unto me, That it concerns him as much as his life is worth, to go presently to such a place, and that he knows but one way to it, and I should see him stand still or go some other way, Had I any reason to believe that this man believes himself? *Quid Verba audiam, cum facta videam?* saith he in the Comedy; *Protestatio contra factum non valet*, saith the Law; and why should I believe, that that man believes obedience to Christ the only way to present and eternal happiness, whom I see wittingly, and willingly, and constantly, and customarily to disobay him? The time was, that we all knew that the King could reward those that did him service, and punish those that did him dis-service, and then all men were ready to obey his Command, and he was a rare man that durst do any thing to his face that offended him. Beloved, if we did but believe in God, so much as most Subjects do in their King; did we as verily believe, that God could and would make us perfectly happy, if we serve him, though all the world conspire to make us miserable, and that he could and would make us miserable if we serve him not, though all the world should conspire to to make us happy, How were it possible that to such a faith our lives should not be conformable? Who was there ever so madly in love with a present penny, as to run the least hazard of the loss of 10000 *l.* a year to gain it, or not readily to part with it upon any probable hope or light perswasion, much more a firm belief that by doing so he should gain 100000 *l.* Now, beloved, the happiness which the servants of Christ are promised in the Scripture, we all pretend to believe, that it exceeds the conjunction of all the good things of the world, and much more such a portion as we may possibly enjoy, infinitly more then 10000 *l.* a year, or 100000 *l.* doth a penny; for, 100000 *l.* is but a penny so many times over, and 10000 *l.* a year is worth but a certain number of pence; but between heaven and earth, between finite and infinite, between eternity and a moment, there is utterly no proportion; and therefore seeing we are so apt, upon trifling occasions, to hazard this heaven for this earth, this infinite for this finite, this all for this nothing; is it not much to be feared, that though many of us pretend to much faith, we have indeed very little or none at all? The sum of all which hath been spoken concerning this point is this: Were we firmly perswaded, that obedience to the Gospel of Christ, is the true and only way to present and eternal happiness, (without which faith, no man living can be justified) then the innate desire of our own happiness could not but make us studious inquirers of the will of Christ, and conscionable performers of it; but there are (as experience shews) very few, who make it their care and business to know the will of Christ; and of those few again, very many who make no conscience at all of doing what they know: therefore though they profess and protest they have faith, yet their protestations are not to be regarded against their actions, but we may safely and reasonably conclude what was to be concluded, That the Doctrin of Christ, amongst an infinite of professors, labours with great scarcity of true, and serious, and hearty believers; and that herein also we accomplish St. *Pauls* prediction, *Having a form of godliness, but denying*, &c.

But

But perhaps the truth and reality of our repentance may make some kind of satisfaction to God Almighty for our hypocritical dallying with him in all the rest; truly, I should be heartily glad it were so: but I am so far from being of this faith, that herein I fear we are most of all hypocritical, and that the generality of professors is so far from a reall practise of true Repentance, that scarce one in an hundred understands truly what it is.

Some satisfie themselves with a bare confession and acknowledgement either that they are sinners in general, or that they have committed such and such sins in particular; which acknowledgement comes not yet from the heart of a great many, but only from their lips and tongues: For how many are there that do rather complain and murmure that they are sinners, then acknowledge and confess it? and make it, upon the matter, rather their unhappiness and misfortune, then their true fault, that they are so? Such are all they who impute all their commissions of evil to the unavoydable want of *restraining grace*, and all their omission of good to the like want of *effectual exciting grace*. All such as pretend that the Commandements of God are impossible to be kept any better then they are kept; and that the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, are even omnipotent enemies; and that God neither doth, nor will, give sufficient strength to resist and overcome them. All such as lay all their faults upon *Adam*, and say with those rebellious *Israelites* (whom God assures, That they neither had nor should have just reason to say so) *That their Fathers had eaten sour grapes, and their teeth were set on edge*. Lastly, all such as lay all their sins upon *divine prescience*, and *predestination*, saying with their tongues, O what wretched sinners have we been; but in their hearts, How could we help it, we were predestinate to it, we could not do otherwise.

All such as seriously so persuade themselves, and think to hide their nakedness with such fig-leaves as these, can no more be said to acknowledg themselves guilty of a fault, then a man that was born blind or lame, with the Stone or Gout, can accuse himself of any fault for being born so; well may such a one complain and bemone himself, and say, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this unhappiness! but such a complaint is as farr from being a true acknowledgement of any fault, as a bare acknowledgement of a fault is farr from true repentance: for, to confess a fault, is, to acknowledge, that, freely and willingly, without any constraint, or unavoydable necessity, we have transgressed the law of God, it being *in our power by God's grace*, to have done otherwise. To aggravate this fault is to confess we have done so, when we might easily have avoyded it, and had no great nor violent temptation to it; to pretend any great difficulty in the matter, is to excuse and extenuate it: but to say, that, all things considered, it was absolutely impossible for you to avoid it, is flatly to deny it. Others there are that think they have done enough, if to confession of sin, they add some sorrow for it; if when the present fit of sin is past, and they are returned to themselves, the sting remaining, breed some remorse of conscience, some complaints against their wickedness and folly for having done so, and some intentions to forsake it, though vanishing and ineffectual: These heat-drops, this morning dew of sorrow, though it presently vanish, and they return to their sin again upon the next temptation *as a dogg to his vomit*, when the pang is over; yet in the pauses between, while

while they are in their good mood, they conceive themselves to have very true, and very good repentance; so that if they should have the good fortune to be taken away in one of these *Intervalla*, one of these sober moods, they should certainly be saved; which is just as if a man in a Quartane Ague, or the Stone, or Gout, should think himself rid of his disease as oft as he is out of his fit.

But if repentance were no more but so; how could St. *Paul* have truly said, *That godly sorrow worketh repentance?* Every man knows that nothing can work it self. The Architect is not the house which he builds, the Father is not the Son which he begets, the Tradesman is not the work which he makes; and therefore if sorrow, godly sorrow, worketh repentance, certainly sorrow is not repentance: the same St. *Paul* tels us in the same place, *That the sorrow of the world worketh death*; and you will give me leave to conclude from hence, therefore it is not death; and what shall hinder me from concluding thus also, Godly sorrow worketh repentance, therefore it is not repentance. 1 Cor. 7. 10.

To this purpose it is worth the observing, that when the Scripture speaks of that kind of repentance, which is only sorrow for something done, and wishing it undone, it constantly useth the word Μεταμέλεια, to which forgiveness of sins is no where promised. So it is written of *Judas* the son of perdition, *Matth.* 27. 5. Μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήγξατο, *he repented and went and hanged himself*, and so constantly in other places. But that repentance to which remission of sins and salvation is promised, is perpetually expressed by the word Μετάνοια, which signifieth a through change of the heart and soul, of the life and actions, Μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, *Mat.* 3. 2. which is rendred in our last translation, *Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand*: But much better, because freer from ambiguity in the entrance to our *Common Prayer Book*, *Amend your lives, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. From whence, by the way, we may observe, That in the judgment of those holy and learned Martyrs, *Repentance, and amendment of life* are all one: And I would to God, the same men, out of the same care of avoyding mistakes, and to take away occasion of cavilling our Liturgy from them that seek it, and out of fear of encouraging carnal men to security in sinning, had been so provident, as to set down in terms, the first sentence taken out of the 18th. of *Ezekiel*, and not have put in the place of it an ambiguous, and (though not in it self, yet accidentally, by reason of the mistake to which it is subject,) I fear very often a pernitious paraphrase; for whereas thus they make it, *At what time soever a sinner doth repent him of his sins from the bottom of his heart, I will put all his wickedness out of my remembrance, saith the Lord*; The plain truth, if you will hear it, is, the Lord doth not say so, these are not the very words of God, but the paraphrase of men: the words of God are as followeth -- *If the wicked turn from all the sins which he hath committed, and keep all my Statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die*; where, I hope, you easily observe that there is no such word as, *At what time soever a sinner doth repent*, &c. and that there is a wide difference between this (as the word *repent* usually sounds in the ears of the people) and turning from all sins, and keeping all Gods Statutes: that indeed, having no more in it but sorrow and good purposes, may be done easily and certainly at the last gasp, and it is very strange that any Christian, who dies in his right senses, and knows the difference between heaven

heaven and hell, ſhould fail of the performing it: but this work of turning, keeping, and doing, is (though not impoſſible by extraordinary mercy to be performed at laſt) yet ordinarily a work of time, a long and laborious work (but yet heaven is very well worth it) and if you mean to go through with it, you had need go about it preſently. Yet ſeeing the Compoſers of our Liturgy thought fit to abreviate, *Turning from all ſin, and keeping all God's Statutes, and doing that which is lawful and right*, into this one word, *Repenting*, it is eaſie and obvious to collect from hence, as I did before, from the other place, that by Repentance, they underſtood not only ſorrow for ſin, but converſion from it. The ſame word Μετανοια, *Mat.* 12. 42. is uſed in ſpeaking of the Repentance of the *Ninivites*: And, how real, hearty, and effectual a Converſion that was, you may ſee *Jonas* 3. from the 5 to the laſt verſe. *The People of* Niniveh *believed God, and put on ſackcloth from the greateſt of them to the leaſt of them; for word came to the King of* Niniveh, *and he aroſe from his Throne, and he caſt his Robe from him, and covered him with ſackcloth, and ſate in aſhes; and he cauſed it to be proclaimed and publiſhed throughout* Niniveh, *by the decree of the King and of his Nobles, ſaying: Let neither man nor beaſt, heard, nor flock, taſte any thing, let them not feed, nor drink water; but let man and beaſt be covered with ſackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let every one turn from his evill way, and from the violence which is in their hands, who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away his fierce anger that we periſh not?*

Which words contain an excellent and lively pattern for all true penitents to follow, and whereunto to conform themſelves in their humiliation and repentance. And truly, though there be no *Jonas* ſent expreſly from God to cry unto us, *Yet forty dayes and Niniveh ſhall be deſtroyed*; yet ſeeing the mouth of Eternal Truth hath taught us, that *a Kingdom divided* is in ſuch danger of ruin and deſtruction, that morally ſpeaking, if it continue divided it cannot ſtand; and ſeeing the ſtrange and miſerable condition of our Nation at this time, may give any conſiderable man juſt cauſe to fear, that as in *Rehoboam*'s caſe, ſo likewiſe in ours, *The thing is of the Lord*, intending to bring his heavy judgment upon us, for our great ſins, and our ſtupid, and ſtupendious ſecurity in ſinning, and to make us inſtruments of his deſigned vengeance, one upon another; peradventure it would be a ſeaſonable and neceſſary motion to be made to our King and his Nobles -- To revive this old *Proclamation* of the King of *Nineveh*, and to ſend it with authority through His Majeſties dominions, and to try whether it will produce ſome good effect: *Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we periſh not?* Who can tell, whether he that hath the hearts of King and People in his hand, and turneth them whitherſoever he thinketh beſt, may not upon our repentance take our extreamity for his oportunity, and at laſt open our eyes that we *may ſee thoſe things that belong to our peace*, and ſhew us the way of Peace, which hitherto we have not known: but this by the way; For my purpoſe, I obſerve, That this Repentance, which, when the ſword of God was drawn, and his arm advanced for a blow, ſtayd his hand, and ſheathed his ſword again, was not a meer ſorrow for their ſins, and a purpoſe to leave them; nay, it was not only laying aſide their gallantry and bravery, and putting on ſackcloth and ſitting in aſhes, and crying mightily unto God,

of

of which yet we are come very short: but it was also, and that chiefly, their universal turning from their evil way, which above all the rest was prevalent and effectual with God Almighty: for so it is written, *And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way, and God repented him of the evil that he sayed he would do, and he did it not.*

In the Gospel of S. *Luke*, cap. 24. The condition of the new Covenant, to which remission of sins is promised, is expressed by the word Μετανοιαι. ---- *Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead, and that* (Μετάνοια) *Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name.* Which place, if ye compare with that in the Gospel of S. *Matth. Go teach all Nations baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost, teaching them to observe all whatsoever I shall command you*; It will be no difficulty to collect, that what out Saviour calls in one place Μετάνοια, repentance, that he calls, in another, Observing all that he hath commanded; which, if repentance were no more but sorrow for sin, and intending to leave it, certainly he never could, nor would, have done: And as little could S. *Paul*, *Act.* 20. 21. profess, that the whole matter of his preaching was nothing else but Μετάνοια εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, *Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* It being manifest in his Epistles, he preaches and presses every where, the necessity of mortification, regeneration, new, and sincere obedience, all which are evidently not contained under the head of *Faith*; and therefore it is evident he comprized all these under the name of *Repentance*.

In which words moreover it is very considerable, as also in another place, *Heb.* 6. where among the fundamentals of Christianity the first place is given to Μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, I say, it is very considerable, that though the word may not very absolutely be rendred Repentance; yet we shall do much right to the places, and make them much more clear and intelligible, if instead of *repentance*, we should put *conversion*, as it is in some of the best *Latin* Translations: So, for example, if instead of *repentance to God*, *Act.* 20. and *repentance from dead works*, in the Epistle to the *Heb.* which our *English* tongue will hardly bear; we should read *conversion to God*, *and conversion from dead works*, every one sees, it would be more perspicuous and more natural; whereas, on the other side, if, instead of repentance, we should substitute sorrow (as every true genuine interpretation may with advantage to the clearness of the sense, be put in place of the word interpreted), and read the place *sorrow towards God*, and *sorrow from dead works*, it is apparent that this reading would be unnatural, and almost ridiculous: which is a great argument, that Μετανοια, to which forgivenes of sins is promised in the Gospel, is not only sorrow for sin, but conversion from sin.

And yet if it be not so, but that Heaven may be purchased at easier, and cheaper rates: how comes it to pass, that in the New-Testament, we are so plainly, and so frequently assured, that without actual, and effectual amendment, and newness of life; without actual, and effectual mortification, regeneration, sanctification; there is no hope, no possibility of Salvation.

Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. So S. *John* Baptist preaches repentance. It is not then the leaves of a fair profession, no nor the blossoms of good purposes and intentions, but the fruit, the fruit only, that can save us from the fire; neither is it enough Matth. 3. 9.

not to bear ill fruit, unleſs we bring forth good. *Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and caſt into the fire.*

Not every one that ſayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven: So our *Saviour*, Matth. 7. 21. And again, after he had delivered his moſt divine Precepts in his Sermon on the Mount, (which Sermon contains the ſubſtance of the Goſpel of Chriſt:) he cloſeth up all with ſaying: *He that heareth theſe ſayings of mine, and doth them not*, (and yet theſe were the hardeſt ſayings that ever he ſayed) *I will liken him to a fooliſh man, which built his houſe upon the ſand*, (that is, his hope of Salvation, upon a ſandy and falſe ground) *and when the rain deſcended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that Houſe, it fell, and great was the fall of it.*

They that are Chriſts have crucified the fleſh with the affections and luſts: So S. *Paul*, *Gal.* 5. 24. They then that have not done ſo, nor crucified the fleſh with the affections and luſts, let them be as ſorrowful as they pleaſe, let them intend what they pleaſe, they as yet are none of Chriſts, and, good Lord! What a multitude of Chriſtians then are there in the world that do not belong to Chriſt?

Gal. 5. 19, 20, 21. *The works of the fleſh*, ſaith the ſame S. *Paul*, *are manifeſt, which are theſe, Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanneſs, Laſciviouſneſs, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Hereſies, Envyings, Murthers, Drunkenneſs, Revellings; of which I tell you before, as I have told you in times paſt, that they which do ſuch things ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* He doth not ſay, they which have done ſuch things ſhall not be ſaved, but manifeſtly to the contrary,---*Such were ſome of you, but ye are waſhed, but ye are ſanctified*; but he ſays; they *which do* ſuch things, and without amendment of life ſhall continue doing them, ſhall not be excuſed, by any pretence of ſorrow and good purpoſes. *They ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.*

And again in another Epiſtle, *Know ye not, that the unrighteous ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor abuſers of themſelves with mankinde, nor Theeves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Revilers, ſhall inherit the Kingdom of God.*

In Chriſt Jeſus (ſaith the ſame S. *Paul*, in other places) *nothing availeth but faith: nothing but a new creature: nothing but keeping the Commandements of God*; it is not then a wiſhing, but a working faith; not wiſhing you were a new Creature, nor ſorrowing you are not, but being a new creature; not wiſhing you had kept, nor ſorrowing you have not kept, nor purpoſing vainly to keep, but keeping his Commandements muſt, prevail with him.

Follow peace with all men, and holineſs, (ſaith the Divine Author of the Epiſtle to the *Heb.*) *without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord.*

Saint *Peter* in his ſecond Epiſtle, commends unto us a golden chain of Chriſtian perfections; conſiſting of theſe links, *Faith, vertue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godlineſs, brotherly kindneſs, charity*: and then adds, ---*He that lacketh theſe things, is blind, and knoweth not that he was purged from his old ſins.* Let his ſorrow be never ſo great, and his deſires never ſo good, yet if he lack theſe things, he is blind; and *was purged* from his old ſins, *but is not.*

Laſtly,

Lastly St. *John*; *He that hath this hope purifieth himself, even as he is pure*, the meaning is not with the same degree of purity, for that is impossible, but with the same kind, the same truth of purity, he that doth not purifie himself may, nay doth, flatter himself, and, without warrant, presume upon God's favour, but *this hope* he hath not; and again, *Little Children, let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous*; And thus you see all the divine Writers of the New Testament, with one consent, and with one mouth, proclaim the necessity of real holiness, and labour together to disinchant us, from this vain phantie, That men may be saved, by sorrowing for their sin and intending to leave it, without effectual conversion and reformation of life; which, it may well be feared, hath sent thousands of souls to hell, in a golden dream of heaven.

But is not this to preach works as the Papists do? No certainly, it is not; but to preach works as Christ and his Apostles do: it is to preach the necessity of them, which no good Protestant, no good Christian ever denyed; but it is not to preach the merit of them, which is the error of the Papists.

But is it not to preach the Law in time of the Gospel? No certainly, it is not: for the Law forgives no sins, but requires exact obedience, and *curseth* every one which from the beginning to the end of his life, *continueth not in all things which are written in the Law to do them*; but the Gospel sayes, and accordingly I have said unto you, that there is mercy alwayes in store, for those *who know the day of their visitation*, and forsake their sins in time of mercy, and that God will pardon their imperfections in the progress of holiness, who miscall not presuptuous and deliberate Sins by the name of Imperfections; but seriously and truly endeavour to be perfect: Only I forewarn you that you must never look to be admitted to the wedding feast of the Kings Son, either in the impure rags of any customary sin, or without the *wedding garment* of Christian holiness; only I forewarn you, that whosoever looks to be made partaker of the joyes of heaven, must make it the chief, if not the only, business of his life, to know the will of God, and to do it; that, *great violence* is required by our Saviour for the taking of this Kingdom, that the race we are to run is a long race, the building we are to erect is a great building, and will hardly, very hardly be finished in a day; that the work we have to do of mortifying all vices, and acquiring all Christian vertues, is a long work; we may easily deferr it too long, we cannot possibly begin it too soon. Only I would perswade you, and I hope I have done it, that that Repentance which is not effectual to true and timely Conversion, will never be available unto eternal Salvation. And if I have proved unto you, that this is indeed the nature of true Repentance, then certainly, I have proved withall, that that Repentance wherewith the generality of Christians content themselves, notwithstanding their great professions what they are, and their glorious protestations of what they intend to be, is not the *power* but the *form*; not the truth but the shadow of true Repentance; and that herein also we accomplish St. *Pauls* prediction, *Having a form of godliness*, &c.

And now what remains, but that (as I said in the beginning) I should humbly intreat, and earnestly exhort every man that hath heard me this day, to confute in his particular, what I have proved true in the general;

To take care that the sin of formality, though it be the sin of our times, may yet not be the sin of our persons, that we satisfie not our selves with the shadows of Religion, without the substance of it, nor with the *form of godliness* without the *power* of it.

To this purpose I shall beseech you to consider, That though sacrificing, burning incense, celebrating of set festivals, praying, fasting, and such like, were, under the Law, the service of God commanded by himself; yet whensoever they proceed not from, nor were joyned with, the sincerity of an honest heart; he professeth frequently almost in all the Prophets, not only his scorn and contempt of them all, as fond, empty, and ridiculous; but also his hating, loathing, and detesting of them as abominable and impious.

The Sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to God, Prov. 15. 8. *What have I to do with the multitude of your Sacrifices? saith the Lord*, Esay the first, *I am full of the burnt offerings of Rams, and of the fat of fed beasts, when ye come to appear before me, who required this at your hands? Bring no more vain oblations: Incense is an abomination to me, I cannot suffer your new moons, nor sabbaths, nor solemn dayes, it is iniquity even your solemn assemblies: My soul hateth your new moons, and your appointed feasts, they are a burthen to me, I am weary to bear them; and when you shall stretch out your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you, and though you make many prayers I will not hear, for your hands are full of blood.*

And again, *Isa.* 66. 3. *He that kils an Ox is as if he slew a man, he that sacrificeth a Lamb as if he cut off a Dogs neck, he that offereth an Oblation as if he offered Swines-flesh, he that burneth incense as if he blessed an Idol*; and what's the reason of this strange aversion of God from his own Ordinances? it follows in the next words, *They have chosen their own wayes, and their soul delighteth in their abominations.*

Terrible are the words which he speaketh to the same purpose in the prophecy of *Amos*, *chap.* 5. *vers.* 21, 22, 23. *I hate, I despise your feast dayes, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies, though you offer me burnt offerings and meat offerings, I will not accept them, nor will I regard your peace offerings.*

Now, beloved, if this hypocrisie, this resting in outward performances were so odious to God under the law, a religion full of shadows, and ceremonies; certainly it will be much more odious to do so under the Gospel, a religion of much more simplicity, and exacting so much the greater sincerity of the heart, even because it disburdens the outward man of the performance of Legal rites and observances. And therefore if we now vnder the Gospel, shall think to delude God Almighty, as *Michol* did *Saul*, with an Idoll handsomly dresst instead of the true *David*; if we shall content and please our selves, with being of such or such a Sect or Profession; with going to Church, saying, or hearing of Prayers, receiving of Sacraments, hearing, repeating or preaching of Sermons, with zeal for Ceremonies, or zeal against them; or, indeed, with any thing besides constant piety towards God, Loyalty and obedience towards our Soveraign, justice and charity towards all our Neighbours, temperance, chastity, and sobriety towards our selves, certainly we shall one day find, that we have not mocked God, but our selves, and that our portion among Hypocrites shall be greater than theirs.

In the next place, let me intreat you to consider the fearful judgement which God hath particularly threatned to this very sin of *Drawing nigh unto him with our lips, when our hearts are farr from him.* It is the great judgement of being given over to *the spirit of slumber and security*; the usual forerunner of speedy desolation and destruction, as we may see in the 29 *Chap. of Isaiah*, from the 9 to the 14 vers. *Stay your selves and wonder, cry ye out, and cry, They are drunken but not with wine, they stagger but not with strong drink: for the Lord hath powred out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes. The Prophets, and your Rulers, the Seers hath he covered:* and after, at the 14 verse, *The wisdom of their Wise-men shall perish, and the understanding of their Prudent-men shall be hid.* Certainly, this judgement if ever it were upon any people, we have cause to fear it is now upon us. For, if the spirit of *deep sleep* were not upon us, How could we sleep so securely even upon the brink of the pit of perdition? How could we proceed on so confidently in our mirth and jollity, nay, in our crying sins and horrible impieties; now when the hand of God is upon us, and wrath is gone out and even ready to consume us? and if the wisdom of our Wise-men were not perished, How were it possible they should so obstinately refuse the security offered of our Laws, Liberties, and Religion, by the King's Oath, by his Execrations on himself, and his posterity, in case he should violate it; by the Oaths of all his Ministers not to consent to, or be instruments in, such a Violation; by the so much desired *Triennial Parliament*, from which no transgressor can possibly be secure; and instead of all this security, seek for it by a Civil Warr, the continuance whereof, must bring us to destruction and desolation, or else He hath deceived us by whom we are taught, *That a Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand.*

Now what was the sin which provoked this fearful judgement? What but that which I have laboured to convince you of, and to dissuade you from, even the sin of Hypocrisie; as we may see at the 12 verse, *Wherefore saith the Lord, for as much as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart farr from me; and their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men: therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work amongst them; for the wisdom of their Wise-men shall perish*, &c.

Consider, Thirdly, what woes, and woes, and woes our Saviour thunders out against the Scribes and Pharisees for their Hypocrisie, *Wo be unto you Scribes, and Pharisees, Hypocrites*; and again and again, *Wo be unto you Scribes, and Phariſes, Hypocrites.* Beloved, if we be Hypocrites as they were, *Tithe mint and cumin, and neglect the weighty matters of the Law, judgement, and justice, and mercy*, as they did: *Make long prayers, and under a pretence devour Widows houses*, as they did: *Wash the outside of the dish and platter, while within we are full of ravening and wickedness*; write God's Commandements very large and fair upon our *Phylacteries*, but shut them quite out of our hearts: *Build the Sepulchres of the old Prophets, and kill their successors:* in fine, if we be like *painted Sepulchres*, as they were, *outwardly garnished and beautiful, but within full of dead mens bones and rottenness*; we are then to make accompt that all these woes belong to us, and will one day overtake us.

Consider, lastly, the terrible example of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and how they were snatcht away in the very act of their sin, and that their fault was (as the Text tells us) that *they lyed unto God*. Beloved, we have done so a thousand thousand times: our whole lives (if sincerely examined) would appear, I fear, little less but a perpetual lye; hitherto God hath been merciful to us, and given us time to repent; but let us not proceed still in imitating their fact, lest at length we be made partakers of their fall.

God of his infinite mercy prevent this in every one of us, even for his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's sake; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the holy Spirit, be all honour and glory to the eternal Father, world without end: *Amen.*

The

The Second Sermon.

Psalm XIV. 1.

The Fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God.

IF you will turn over ſome few leaves, as farr as the 53 *Pſalm*, you ſhall not only find my Text, but this whole Pſalm; without any alteration, ſave only in the fift verſe, and that not at all in the ſenſe neither. What ſhall we ſay? Took the holy Spirit of God ſuch eſpecial particular notice of the ſayings and deeds of a Fool, that one expreſſion of them would not ſerve the turn? Or, does the babling and madneſs of a Fool ſo much concern us, as that we need to have them urg'd upon us once and again, and a third time in the 3d. of the *Romans*? Surely not any one of us preſent here, is this Fool: Nay, if any one of us could but tell were to find ſuch a Fool as this, that would offer to ſay, though in his heart, *There is no God*; he ſhould not reſt in quiet, he ſhould ſoon perceive we were not of his faction.

2. We! that are able to tell *David* an Article or two of faith, more then ever he was acquainted with! Nay more: Can we, with any imaginable ground of reaſon be ſuppoſed liable to any ſuſpition of Atheiſm, that are able to read to *David* a Lecture out of his own *Pſalms*, and explain the meaning of his own Prophecies, much clearer then himſelf, which held the pen to the holy Spirit of God? Though we cannot deny, but that in other things there may be found ſome ſpice of folly and imperfection in us: But it cannot be imagined, that we who are almoſt cloyed with the heavenly Manna of God's Word, that can inſtruct our Teachers, and are able to maintain Opinions and Tenents, the ſcruples whereof not both the Univerſities of this Land, nor the whole Clergy, are able to reſolve; that it ſhould be poſſible for us ever to come to that perfection and excellency of Folly and Madneſs, as to entertain a thought, that *there is no God*: Nay, we are not ſo uncharitable as to charge a Turk or an Infidel with ſuch an horrible imputation as this.

3. Beloved Chriſtians, be not wiſe in your own conceipts: If you will ſeriouſly examine the 3d. of the *Romans* (which I mentioned before) you

ſhall

shall find that St. *Paul*, out of this *Psalm*, and the like words of *Isaiah*, doth conclude the whole posterity of *Adam* (Christ only excepted) under sin and the curse of God: which inference of his were weak and inconcluding, unless every man of his own nature, were such a one as the Prophet here describes; and the same Apostle in another place expresses, *Even altogether without God in the world*; *i. e.* not maintaining it as an opinion which they would undertake by force of argument to confirm, That there is no God: For, we read not of above 3 or 4 among the Heathens, that were of any fashion, which were thus farr; But such as, though in their discourse and serious thoughts they do not question a Deity, but would abhor any man that would not liberally allow unto God all his glorious Attributes; yet in their hearts and affections they deny him; they live as if there was no God, having no respect at all to him in all their projects, and therefore indeed, and in God's esteem, become formally, and in strict propriety of speech, very Atheists.

4. That this is most true, and that therefore many, who, because they are Orthodox in opinion, have thereupon a great conceit of their faith towards God; yet, being strictly examined, shall be found to have built such glorious buildings in shew upon Sand; or, which is worse, to have made *hay and stubble* (matter fit only for the fire) foundations of many golden hopes, and glorious presumptions, must be shewed at large hereafter.

5. The words now read, are a secret confession which the Fool whispers to his own heart: He neither can nor dare profess this openly, and when he cals his reason to counsel about this business, the question is farr otherwise stated. The words do not run thus, The Fool being convinced by evidence of reason and demonstration, hath concluded, There is no God; no, this is no Heathenish Philosophical fool, he is quite of another temper: This is a worldly, proud, malicious, projecting wise fool, a fool that knows it is for his advantage to put God out of his thoughts; and therefore doth forcibly captivate, and wilfully hoodwink his understanding, and thinks he hath obtained a great victory, if he can contrive any course to bring himself to that pass, that no cold melancholy thoughts of God or Hell, may interrupt or restrain him from freely wallowing in the lusts and uncleanness of his heart, without any remorse, without any reluctance or griping within him. It is for his Heart's sake, the love that he bears to the lusts thereof, that makes him an Atheist: If it could stand with that course and trade of life that he is resolved upon, to entertain contrary thoughts, he would as soon work his judgment and thoughts another way. And therefore in his open profession, it sometimes fals out, that even when he wishes there were no God, yet he is a very forward zealous acknowledger in general of God and his glorious Attributes: So that the same desire of a quiet and uninterrupted enjoying the scope and freedom of the lusts and affections of his heart, makes him both a resolute secret Atheist, and withal wise enough to keep his folly to himself, and to make none else acquainted with his curious art and method of such woful self-deceiving, but his dearly beloved Heart. *The Fool*, &c.

6. The discussion of these words, does not engage me to a dividing or descanting upon the whole Psam: Let it suffice, that we may most probably conceive, that *David* in this Psalm intends the description of the woful estate of that Kingdom, after God had taken away his good Spirit from *Saul*;

Saul; wherein the secret Enemies of God did greedily lay hold on that occasion to vex and despite, and, as much as was in their power, to lay waste the heritage of God.

7. *The Fool* (who is the person that through the whole Psalm works all the mischief), in the Original is, *Nabal*: which hath the signification of fading, dying, or falling away, as doth a leaf, or flower, *Isai.* 40. 8. And is a Title given to the foolish man, as having lost the juyce and sap of wisdom, reason, honesty, and godliness; being fallen from grace, ungrateful, and without the life of God: As a dead carkass (which of this word is called *Nebalah*, *Levit.* 11. 40.) and therefore ignoble and of vile esteem, oppos'd to the Noble-man, *Isa.* 32. 5. The Apostle in the Greek turneth it imprudent, or without understanding, *Rom.* 10. 19. from *Deut.* 32. 21.

8. *Hath said in his Heart, There*, &c. *i. e.* Not so much perswadeth himself in secret, that *there is no God*; But rather expresseth so in his life, or in his affections, which are called the Heart, in the phrase of God: proportionable to the same expression of *David*, Psal. 10. 4. *The wicked through the pride of his countenance will not seek after God, God is not in all his crafty purposes.* If you would have the full sense of my Text more largely expres'd, turn to *Tit.* 1. 16. where persons of the same mould that the Prophet here complains of, are thus described, *They profess that they know God, but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and to every good work void of judgment.* Psal. 10. 4. Tit. 1. 16

9. Where are observable First, the cause of this Practical Atheism, in these last words of the verse, *They were to every good work*, ἀδόκιμοι, and that was Ignorance, or rather Imprudence, Inconsiderance: Implying not a bare want of knowledg; but an abusing thereof, in not reducing it to practise, in hiding the light which was in them under a bushel. Secondly, Then we have the manner of the expression of this Atheism, *viz.* not in words, or opinion, to deny God; but, which is worse, in the carriage and course of our life; to allow him his Attributes, and yet not to fear him, not to stand in awe of his power, which he acknowledgeth to be infinite, to distrust his Providence to sleight his Promises, neglect his Threatnings, which is in effect, as much as in him lyeth, to tear and ravish from him all his glorious Attributes, by living, as if God himself were less powerful, less wise then himself, improvident, not deserving so much fear of his power, or respect to his command, as he would perform to a wretched mortal man, that is a little richer, or in some place of Authority above him.

10. I need travel no further for a division to my own Text: Here we may observe likewise, First, The cause of Atheism, and by consequence, all the abominable impieties that follow in the Psalm, and that is, Ignorance, Indiscretion, Inconsiderance, expressed in the person of *Nabal*, *The Fool*: Secondly, We have the expression of it, not by word of mouth, or writing; but *per motum cordis*, by the inclination of the heart, or affections. 1. 2.

11. In the prosecution of the former part (which may very well take up and spend this Hour-glass) I shall proceed thus: First, I will consider, wherein this folly consists, and that is not so much in an utter ignorance of God and his holy Word, as a not making a good use of it when it is known, a suffering it to lye dead, to swim unprofitably in the brain, without any fruit thereof in the reformation of ones life and conversation; 1.

And

And there I will shew you, The extream folly for a man to seek to increase his knowledge of his Master's will, without a desire and resolution
2. to increase proportionably in a serious active performance thereof. Secondly, I will propose to your consideration the extream unavoidable danger, and increase of guilt, that knowledge without practice brings with it: To both which considerations I shall severally annex Applications to the Consciences of you my Hearers, and so spend out my time.

12. Now I take it for granted, that I have hit right in declaring wherein the folly of *Nabal* in my Text consists, namely, in an unfruitful knowledg, a knowledg that lies fallow, is not exercised: which if it were not allowed me, I would only referr my self for proof unto some of *David*'s Psalms, and almost all his Sons Proverbs: I should sin against the plenty of matter in my Text more worth our consideration, if I should enlarge my self in this point: Only one place of *David* shall suffice,
Psal. 111. 10. and that is in *Psal.* 111. 10. where he repeats that old divine Proverb made by God himself, the Lord knows how long since, and by him delivered to man, as *Job* telleth us, *ch.* 28. *v.* 28. The Psalmists words are these, *The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, and a good understanding have all they that do thereafter.*

13. I do not now exclude Ignorance from making up some part of this Fool; but because the other piece of extream desperate folly is rather the sin of these days, namely, a barren uneffectual Knowledge; Therefore I shall rather insist upon it: Yet, by the way, I shall not fail to discover to you the danger of the other too.

14. It is a pretty Observation, that the Author of the Narration of the *English* Seminary founded in *Rome*, has concerning the Method and Order the Devil has used in assailing and disturbing the peace and quiet of the Church, with Heresies and Schisms,: He began (saith he) with the first Article of our Creed, concerning one God the Father Almighty, Creatour of Heaven and Earth, against which in the first 300. years he armed the *Simonians*, *Menandrians*, *Basilidians*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, and *Gnosticks*. After the 300th year he opposed the second Article, concerning the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, by his beloved Servants the *Noetians*, *Sabellians*, *Paullians*, *Photinians*, and *Arrians*: After the four hundreth year he sought to undermine the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh Articles of the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the second coming to Judgment, by the Heresies of *Nestorius*, *Theodorus*, *Eutyches*, *Dioscorus*, *Cnapheus*, *Sergius*, &c. After the eight hundred and sixtieth, he assailed the eighth Article concerning the Holy-Ghost, by the Heresie and Schism of the *Greek* Church: Lastly, since the year one thousand, till these times, his business and craft has especially expressed it self in seeking to subvert the ninth and tenth concerning the Holy Catholique Church, and forgiveness of sins, by the aid and Ministery of the Pontificians, Anabaptists, Familists, and the like; And with the deceipts and snares of these his cunning Ministers hath he entangled the greatest part of the now Christian world.

15. But (our blessed and gracious God be praised for it) we, and some with us, have escaped as a Bird out of the snare of the Fowler, the Net was broken and we were delivered. The whole Doctrine of Christian Faith is restored to the Primitive lustre and integrity: Nay more, (which

is

is a greater happineſs then God ever created to thoſe his choſen good ſervants which lived in the Infancy of the Church) the profeſſion of a pure unſpotted Religion is ſo far from being dangerous, or infamous, that we have the Sword of the Civil Magiſtrate, the power and inforcement of the Laws and Statutes, to maintain this our precious Faith without ſtain and undefiled againſt all Heretical and Schiſmatical oppugners thereof.

16. If ever we forget the goodneſs and mercy of God in this our deliverance; then let our tongues cleave to the roof of our mouths; Nay, if in our Songs of joyfulneſs and melody we remember not our eſcape, wherewith the Lord ſnatched us out of *Egypt*, and our victorious paſſage through a Red-Sea of Bloud and Ruin, Thou O Lord wilt not hear our prayers.

27. It was a ſeaſonable admonition that the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* gave to other Gentiles after ſuch a glorious victory and deliverance as this of our's, *Be not high-minded, but fear.* Hereſie is not the only Engine that Satan is furniſhed with to aſſault and infeſt the Church of Chriſt, neither is it the moſt dangerous: He has the cunning to deſtroy Foundations, and make no uſe of Hereſie in the work neither. You would wonder how it ſhould be poſſible for the Devil to make an Orthodox Chriſtian, one perfect and ſtudyed in all the Points of the Creed, and one that can for a need maintain the Truth thereof againſt all gain-ſayers; I ſay, it would ſeem ſtrange for the Devil to make ſuch a one to deſtroy and utterly demoliſh the very Foundations of his Faith, and yet not at all to alter his opinions neither: Yet, that it is not only a poſſible contrivance, but too too ordinary and familiar in theſe times, woful Experience hath made it evident. Rom. 11. 20.

18. The Art and cunning whereby this great work of the Devil's is brought about, is clearly detected by our Saviour in his Expoſition of the Parable of the Sower, in theſe words, *When they have heard, then cometh the Devil, and taketh away the Word out of their Hearts*, i. e. The Devil will give ſuch people leave freely to hear the Word of God preached, to ſtudy it, diſpute it, to know and be acquainted with all the curious intricate ſubtilties of it, upon condition that they will promiſe to reſolve not to be a jot the better diſpoſed for it in their lives. He can well ſuffer it to ſwim in the Brain, that the Underſtanding ſhould be inlightned, the fancy affected and pleaſed with it, ſo that he may have leave to ſtop the ſecret intercourſe and paſſages thence to the Heart: It troubles him not to have the precious ſeed of the Word entertain'd by a man, ſo that it may be kept up ſafe in Granaries: and not multiply: ſo that the heart be not plough'd up, and furrowed for the receiving of it; as long as there is no fruitful Harveſt there, all goes well. Luk. 7. 12.

19. He will be ſo farr from hindering ſuch from going to the Church, ſo that their errant be to learn what they may be able to talk of, and maintain diſcourſe with, that he could wiſh every day were a Sunday for them, that they might be able by abundance of knowledg, fruitleſs, and void of practiſe, to haſten and aggravate their own damnation.

20. Now whom the Devil thus uſes, whom he thus baits, nay, contents and ſatisfies with an empty, ſpeculative, aerial knowledg, a knowledg only fruitful in increaſing their guilt, and torment, who can deny to be ſotti-

tiſh, ignorant, eaſie fools, childiſhly affected with a knowledge, glorious only in ſhew, without any ſubſtance, or depth at all. And yet this was a temptation ſtrong enough for Paradiſe; for juſt ſo did the Devil entrap *Adam* at the firſt; ſo that, in him, we have received one foil already, at this weapon: And he proceeds dayly, in acting that over again: For what was it which deſtroyed *Adam*, but the preferring of the Tree of Knowledg, before the Tree of Life?

21. St. *James* ſpeaking of ſuch perſons ſo inſnared, ſeems to take much of the envy and guilt of ſo cruel a deceit and couſenage as this is, from off the Devil, and to lay it upon themſelves: *Be not hearers of the Word only, but doers alſo, deceiving your ſelves.* He confeſſes ſuch to be fools, couſened and deceived people; but themſelves, ſaith he, are their own cheaters: wherein lyes a ſtrong emphaſis, expreſſing the extream unhappineſs of ſuch poor deceived wretches. If the cunning inſinuation of one, that for his own ends pretends friendſhip to me, draw me into ſome inconvenience, or danger; the world will think me a fool for being ſo catch'd, and not being able to dive and pierce into his ſecret purpoſes; But this folly is not of ſo perfect a ſtrain, but that it may deſerve both excuſe, and pity: But that man that ſpends his whole life in contriving and plotting, and laying ſnares for his own ſoul; if after all this ado he be indeed caught in the pit, that with ſo much pains he digged only for himſelf, Would not any man forfeit his diſcretion, that ſhould either excuſe, or pitty him? And in ſuch, or worſe a caſe, is he that contents himſelf with bare hearing and knowing the Word.

Jam. 1. 22.

22. Who do you think would undertake to excuſe a Phariſee, if he ſhould be condemned for want of ſpiritual wiſdom: one whoſe profeſſion it was, whoſe trade and courſe of life, to be converſant in the Scriptures: who had ſpent his age in reading the Holy Writ, and teaching others out of it: One that was ſo curious in having the Scripture alwayes near him, that he wore it continually about him; It was a trimming and ornament to his Apparel; It was alwayes in his eyes; It was guarded about the wriſts of his arms, and inſtead of a lace or fringe at the bottom of his garment. If one after all this curioſity of dreſſing, ſedulity in reading, induſtry in teaching, ſhould at length, with ſo good parts, in ſuch good clothes go down into Hell, and, ſo dye for want of true knowledg; Who wou'd adventure to excuſe him, who would dare to pitty him?

23. Yet not one, or two, but the whole Colledge, the whole faction of them, you ſhall find in *Matth.* 23. very near their end. No leſs then eight woes denounced againſt them by our Saviour himſelf, (who is not very forward to deſtroy, he came upon a farr other buſineſs) and all thoſe woes for their folly and blindneſs? In the denouncing of every Woe, but one, he ſtyles them *Hypocrites*. (And an Hypocrite, you know, is the veryeſt fool in the world, for he thinks to couſen and put a cheat upon God, whom yet himſelf confeſſes to be Omniſcient, and who knoweth all things.) In that ſingle woe, he calls them *blind guides*, elſewhere *Fools, and blind.* This was our Saviour's judgment of them, and you may reſt upon it, that it was upon ſufficient grounds.

Matth. 23.

24. But their folly and ridiculous madneſs will yet more appear, if you take notice of the opinion and judgment that theſe very Phariſees gave of themſelves. It is in *Joh.* 7. 48, 49. The occaſion of it, was this. The great Council

Council of the *Sanhedrin*, seeing so many of the ignorant people, (as they thought) seduced by our Saviour; To remedy any further spreading of so dangerous a contagion, They by common advice send Officers to attach him, and to make him sure enough for preaching: The Officers find him busie instructing the people, and, instead of laying hands on him, themselves are even caught, and almost bereft of their Infidelity: When Sermon was done, they return to their Masters, the Rulers and Pharisees, without their Prisoner, and give a good account why they did not fulfil their command, in telling them, they never heard a better Preacher in their lives, *Never man*, say they, *spake like this man*. These wise Magistrates pitying the simplicity and easiness of their Sergeants, answer them thus; *Are ye also deceived? Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who know not the Law, are cursed.* Implying, that if the people had been as well read in the Law of God, as their Teachers were, they would have kept themselves safe enough from the ensnaring Sermons of Christ: But now they may see what difference there is between men utterly unacquainted with Gods Word, and themselves, how subject they are to destruction, and to be cursed of God. Joh. 7. 46. Ver. 47, 48, 49.

25. How is it possible, for the wit of man, to imagine folly and madness of a more perfect strain? Our Saviour Christ, who is Truth it self, did not exact Faith from his followers meerly for his Miracles sake, but sent them to search the Scriptures, *For they*, saith he, *testifie of me*: And yet these wise men, impute it to their knowledg of the Law, that they were freed from this curse into which the poor ignorant people fell. How cunningly have these fools layed a snare for their own lives? Joh. 5. 39.

26. Alas, What could the poor people think, when they heard their Doctors, and Magistrates, (men that were gods to them, that sate in *Moses* Chair), condemned of such extream folly and indiscretion? What will become of us, (might they say), if the Pharisees (from whom all that we know, is but a thin thrifty gleaning) have so many Woes denounc'd against them for want of spiritual knowledge?

27. Certain it was, There were many poor souls, whom the Pharisees kept out of Heaven for company. Our Saviour tells them so much; *Ye neither go into Heaven your selves, nor suffer others to go in:* But they were such as they had infected with their Leaven: Such as made those rotten superstructions, which those great Doctors built upon the Word, foundations of their Faith and Hope: And as certain it is, that many there were, upon whom God out of his gracious favour and mercy, had not bestowed such piercing brains, and enquiring heads, as to make them acquainted with their dangerous Opinions and Traditions. They were such as made better use of that little knowledg they had, than to vent it in discourse, or in maintaining Opinions and Tenents against the Church. They heard the Word with an humble honest heart, submitting themselves wholly to it, and restored their Faith to its proper seat, the Heart and Affections, and it was fruitful in their lives and practise. The wisdom of *Solomon* himself, as long as he gave himself to Idolatry, and Luxury, was folly and madness, to the discretion and prudence of these poor despised people.

28. Thus you see, The Fool, that in my Text, is so madd, as to say, *There is no God*, may have wit enough to understand more; nay, in the

opinion of the world, may make a silly fool of him, that has laid up in his heart unvaluable treasures of spiritual wisdom, and knowledg. And therefore the *Latin* Translation following St. *Paul*, might more significantly have styled him *Imprudens*, than *Insipiens*. For the wisdom which is according to Godliness, doth most exactly answer to that Prudence which moral Philosophers make a general over-ruling Vertue, to give bounds and limits to all our Actions, and to find out a temper and mean wherein we ought to walk: And therefore a most learned Divine, of our Church, yet alive, knew very well what he said, when he defin'd our Faith to be *A spiritual Prudence*; Implying, that Faith bears the same office and sway in the life and practise of a Christian, as Prudence of a moral honest man.

29. Now, saith *Aristotle*, there may be many intemperate, youthful, dissolute spirits, which may have an admirable, piercing, discerning judgment in speculative Sciences, as the Mathematicks, Metaphysicks, and the like; because the dwelling upon such contemplations, does not at all cross, or trouble, those rude untamed passions and affections of theirs: yea they may be cunning in the speculative knowledg of vertues: But all this while they are notwithstanding utterly, invincibly, imprudent; because Prudence requires not only a good discerning judgment and apprehension, but a serenity and calmness in the passions.

30. Therefore the same Philosopher does worthily reprehend some Ancients, who called all vertues, Sciences; and said, that each particular vertue was a several Art: requiring only an enlightning or informing of the Reason, and Understanding, which any, for a little cost and small pains-taking in frequenting the learned Lectures of Philosophers, need not doubt but easily to obtain.

31. This conceit, of so learned a man, does very well deserve our prosecution: And it will not be at all swerving from the business in hand: Therefore I shall shew you, how the Moralist by the force of natural Reason, hath framed to himself a Divinity and Religion, resembling, both in method and many substantial parts, the glorious learning of a Christian. I told you the fore-named Doctor did very well to call our Faith, or Assent to supernatural Mysteries, *A spiritual Prudence*.

32. Now besides moral prudence, nay, before the moralist can make any use thereof, or exercise it in the work of any vertue, there is required another general Vertue, which the Philosopher calls Universal Justice, which is nothing else, but a sobriety and temper in the affections, whereby they are subdued and captiv'd unto well inform'd Reason. So that whatsoever it commands to be done, there is no rebellion, no unwillingness in the Passions, but they proceed readily to execution, though it be never so distasteful to sense.

33. Now how well does this express the nature of Charity: for, What else is Love, but a sweet breathing of the Holy Spirit upon our Passions, whereby the Holy Ghost does, as it did in the beginning of *Genesis*, *incubare aquis*, move by a cherishing, quieting vertue, upon the Sea of our Passions? Did not the same Spirit come to *Eliab* in a soft whisper? He walks not *in Turbine*, in a strong wind to raise a Tempest in our Affections. Now when we have received this *ipsissimam Dei particulam*, (as *Plato* said of the Soul) this shred or portion of the Holy Spirit, which is Charity, how evenly and temperately do we behave our selves to God, and

all

all the world beſides? How willingly and obediently do we ſubmit our ſelves to the performance of whatſoever Faith, out of Gods Word, doth enjoyn us?

34. But yet the Analogy and proportion between theſe two is more evident and obſervable: That Univerſal Juſtice is no particular ſingular vertue, neither hath it any particular ſingular object. (As other vertues have; For example, Temperance, or Abſtinence, which hath to do with ſenſual delights and pleaſures, and none elſe.) But when it is determined to, and faſtens on, the object of a particular vertue, it is converted into, and incorporates with that very vertue: for example, If I do exerciſe this general Habit of obſerving a mean and temper, in things that concern diet, or ſenſual pleaſures, it becomes Abſtinence; if upon objects of terrour, it becomes Fortitude, or Magnanimity: Juſt ſo is it with Charity. For,

35. Charity is a vertue which never goes alone, and is buſied in ſolitary places, being reſerved, and excluded, from the ſociety and communion of other Graces; But it is that which ſeaſons, gives life and efficacy to all the reſt; without which, if it were poſſible for me to enjoy all the Graces that the bountiful hand of God ever ſhowred upon reaſonable Creature; yet, if St. *Paul* ſpeak truth, I ſhould be nothing worth: It is that which fulfils all the Commandements: This is evident to all that ſhall but ſleightly and in haſte read over 1 *Cor.* 13. beginning with verſ. 4. and ſo onwards: where we may behold almoſt all the vertues that can be named, enwrapped in one vertue of Charity; and Love, according to the ſeveral Acts thereof, chang'd and transform'd into ſo many ſeveral Graces. *It ſuffereth long*, and ſo 'tis Longanimity; *It is kind*, and ſo 'tis Courteſie; *It vaunteth not it ſelf*, and ſo 'tis Modeſty; *It is not puffed up*, and ſo 'tis Humility; *It is not eaſily provok'd*, and ſo 'tis Lenity; *It thinketh no evil*, and ſo 'tis Simplicity; *It rejoyceth in the Truth*, and ſo 'tis Verity; *It beareth all things*, and ſo 'tis Fortitude; *It believeth all things*, and ſo 'tis Faith; *It hopeth all things*, and ſo 'tis Confidence: *It endureth all things*, and ſo 'tis Patience; *It never faileth*, and ſo 'tis Perſeverance. 1 Cor. 13. 4, &c.

36. You ſee two glorious and divine Vertues, namely, Faith and Charity, though not naturally expreſs'd, yet pretty well counterfeited by the Moraliſt. And to make up the Analogy compleat, we have the third Royal vertue, which is Hope, reaſonably well ſhadow'd out in that which they call *Intentio Finis*: which is nothing elſe but a fore-taſting of the happineſs which they propoſe to themſelves as a ſufficient reward for all their ſevere and melancholick endeavours.

37. What ſhall we ſay, (my beloved Friends), Shall the Heatheniſh Moraliſt, meerly out of the ſtrength of natural Reaſon, conclude, that the knowledg of what is good and fit to be done, without a practiſe of it upon our affections, and outward actions, to be nothing worth, nay, ridiculous and contemptible? And ſhall we, who have the Oracles of God; nay, the whole perfect will of God fully ſet down in the holy Scriptures, in every page almoſt whereof, we find this urg'd and preſs'd upon us, That to know our Maſters will, without performing, it, is fruitleſs unto us; nay, will intend the heat, and add vertue and power to the lake of fire and brimſtone; reſerved for ſuch empty unfruitful Chriſtians: and ſhall we, I ſay, content our ſelves any longer with bare hearing and knowing of the Word, and no more? God forbid, Rather let us utterly avoid this holy

Temple of God? Let us rather cast his Word behind our backs, and be as ignorant of his holy Will as ever our fore-fathers were: Let us contrive any course to cut off all commerce and entercourse, all communion and acquaintance with our God, rather then when we profess to know him, and willingly to allow him all those glorious Titles and Attributes by which he hath made himself known unto us in his Word, in our hearts to deny him, in our lives and practises to dishonour him and use him despightfully.

38. It were no hard matter, I think, to perswade any, but resolved hardned minds, that Fruit is necessary before any admission into heaven, only by proposing to your considerations the form and process of that Judgment, to which you, every man in his own person, must submit. The Authors word may be taken for the truth of what I shall tell you: for the story we receive from his mouth that shall be Judg of all, and therefore is likely to know what course and order himself will observe.

39. In the General Resurrection, when sentence of absolution, or condemnation, shall be pass'd upon every one according to his deserts, Knowledg is on no side mentioned: but one, because he hath cloathed the naked, and fed the hungry, and done such like works of Charity, he is taken; and the rest, that have not done so much, are refused: Will it avail any one then to say, Lord, we confess, we have not done these works, but we have spent many an hour in hearing and talking of thy Word; nay, we have maintain'd to the utmost of our power, and to our own great prejudice, many Opinions and Tenents: Alas! we little thought, that any spotted imperfect work of ours was requisite, we were resolved that for working thou hadst done enough for us to get us to heaven: Will any such excuses as these serve the turn? Far be it from us to think so.

Mat. 7. 22. 40. If you will turn to *Matth.* 7. 22. you shall find stronger and better excuses then these to no purpose: *Many shall say unto me,* (saith Christ), *Lord, have not we propheſied in thy Name?* These were something more then hearers, they had spent their time in preaching and converting souls unto Christ, (which is a work, if directed to a right end, of the most precious and admirable value, that it is possible for a creature to perform): And yet whiles they did not practise themselves what they taught others, they became Cast-aways. Others there were, *that had cast out Devils, and done many miracles*; And yet so lov'd the unclean spirits, that themselves were possess'd withal, that they could not endure to part company then, and now were never likely.

41. But have not I all this while mistaken my Auditory? Were not these Instructions fitter for the Universities? Had it not been more fit and seasonable for me to have instructed and catechis'd mine hearers, rather than to give them cautions and warnings, lest they should abuse their knowledg? No surely! Instructions to make use of knowledg in our practise and conversation, and not to content our selves with meer knowing, and hearing, and talking of the mysteries of our Salvation, cannot in the most ignorant Congregation be unseasonable. Even the Heathen which were utter strangers from the knowledge of Gods wayes, did notwithstanding render themselves inexcusable, for deteining some part of the Truth, as it were, naturally ingrafted in them, in unrighteousnes. So, that there is no man in the world, but knows much more then he practises,

every

every man hides ſome part, at leaſt, of his Talent in a Napkin, wherefore let every man, even the moſt ignorant that hears me this day, ſearch the moſt inward ſecret corners of his heart for this treaſure of knowledg, and let him take it forth, and put it into the Uſurers hands, and trade thriftily with it, that he may return his Lord his own with encreaſe, *Bleſſed is that ſervant whom his Lord when he cometh ſhall find ſo doing: Verily I ſay unto you, he ſhall make him Ruler over all his Houſehold.*

42. And thus I have gone through one member of my Firſt General, namely, the conſideration, wherein the Imprudence of the Fool in my Text doth conſiſt. In the proſecution whereof, I have diſcovered unto you, how ſeverally Satan plants his Engins for the ſubverſion of the Church; In the Primitive times, when Religion was more ſtirring and active, and Charity in Faſhion, He aſſay'd to corrupt mens underſtandings with Hereſies; and there, by the way, was obſerv'd his order and method, how diſtinctly beginning in thoſe firſt times with the firſt Article he hath orderly ſucceeded to corrupt the next following, and now in theſe laſt dayes, hee's got to even the laſt end of the Creed. But ſince, by the mercy and goodneſs of God, we are delivered, and ſtand *firm in the Faith once delivered to the Saints*; he hath raiſed another Engine againſt us that ſtand, and that is, To work, that our Orthodox Opinions do us no good; which he performs by ſnatching the Word out of our Hearts, and making it unfruitful in our Lives: Now thoſe that are thus enveagl'd and wrought upon, are meerly befool'd by the Devil, or rather by themſelves, for ſo I told you, that Saint *James* ſays: And for an example, I propos'd the learned Phariſees, who for all their learning and knowledg in the Scripture, yet our Saviour denounceth eight ſeveral Woes againſt them for being Fools and blind Guides. So that the Fool in hand was not oppos'd to a Learned man, but to a Prudent man: And therefore a worthy Doctor of our Church did well define Faith to be *A ſpiritual Prudence*, that is, a knowledg ſought out only for practiſe. And there I compared Faith with moral Prudence, and the fruit thereof Charity with the vertue of Univerſal Juſtice. Therefore leſt the very Heathen ſhould riſe up in judgment againſt us for not doing ſo much with the help and advantage of Gods Word as they could without it; I did, and do, beſeech you not to content your ſelves with meer knowing and hearing, with only a conceit of Faith without Works, for that was an ancient Hereſie in the *Nicolaitans*, (whom God, by name, profeſſeth an Hatred to, as *Euſebius* tells us.) And for an effectual motive, I told you, how at the laſt great Tryal, you ſhall not be catechis'd, How well you can ſay your Creed, or how many Catechiſms without Book, but, How fruitful in works of Charity your Faith hath been. And ſo I come to the ſecond member of the Firſt General, namely, the conſideration how dangerous and grievous a burden Knowledg will be, where it is fruitleſs and ineffectual: of which, briefly.

43. I will once again repeat that divine ſentence of the Pſalmiſt in Pſal. 111. 10. *The fear of God is the beginning of wiſdom, and a good underſtanding have all they that do thereafter.* i. e. Till a man put his knowledg in practiſe he is ſo farr from being a good man, that he is ſcarſe a man, hath not the underſtanding of a man till he do, till he fall a work; he was Pſal. 111. 10.

wiſer a great deal before he gained his knowledg; Knowledg alone is a goodly purchaſe in the mean time. It is ſo worthy a purchaſe, that, as it ſhould ſeem by our Saviours account, till a man have obtained ſome competency in knowledg, he hath gotten no right to the Kingdom of Darkneſs and Hell.

44. For certainly, no man can juſtly challenge damnation, but he that is burdened with Sin: Now he that hath no knowledg, but is utterly blind in his underſtanding, hath no ſin, that is, in compariſon; the words are
Joh. 9 39. &c. (*Joh. 9. 39, &c.*) *And Jeſus ſaid, for judgment I am come into this world, that they which ſee not might ſee, and that they which ſee might be made blind*; Not as if Chriſt did imprint, or inflict, blindneſs upon any man, but only occaſionally, that is, thoſe which walk in darkneſs, and love it: when the light comes upon them, and diſcovers their wandring, they hate it, and turn their eyes from it, and become more perverſly and obſtinately blind. In the ſame ſenſe that St. *Paul* ſaith, (*Rom. 7.*) *Sin taking occaſion by the Law becomes more ſinful*; whil'ſt ſin is not oppos'd, it goes on in its courſe quietly; but when the Commandement comes and diſcovers and rebukes it, it becomes furious and abominable, and much more raging and violent.

Verſ. 40. 45. There follows, *And ſome of the Phariſees which were with him, heard theſe words, and ſaid unto him, Are we blind alſo?* There is nothing in the world, that a Phariſee can with leſs patience endure than to hear any intimation given, that he may be ſuſpected of folly: And therefore they were not ſo ſenſible, or conceited of ſome wrong received, when our Saviour call'd them *Generation of Vipers*, as they are when their wiſdom and diſcretion are call'd in queſtion. Witneſs this anſwer; when no man ſpake to them, they ſuſpiciouſly demand, whether Chriſt in his laſt words meant them or no. But what anſwers our Saviour?

Verſ. 41. 46. *Jeſus ſaid unto them: If ye were blind, ye ſhould have no ſin; but now ye ſay, We ſee, therefore your ſin remaineth.* As if he had ſaid, So little ſhall this ſuppoſed knowledg and wiſdom, that ye have, profit you, that you ſhall curſe the time that ever you ſaw the holy Word of God and wiſh that all the Sermons that ever you heard, all the gracious Invitations and ſweet Promiſes which God by the miniſtery of his Servants the Prophets, hath ſent unto you, had been ſentences of ſome horrible death and torments, from the mouth of a ſevere Judg. For, your ſins, which otherwiſe had not been ſo inſupportable, now by your abuſing the knowledg which God hath given you, by your wilful contempt of thoſe many invitations, which have continually ſounded in your ears, are become as a Mountain upon you to cruſh you into powder: You have hang'd a Milſtone about your own necks, which ſhall irrecoverably ſink you into the bottomleſs comfortleſs pit, whereas otherwiſe there might have been ſome hope of eſcape.

47. And yet for all this, let not any one favour and cheriſh himſelf in this conceipt, That, he thanks God, he is ignorant enough, that a very little practiſe will ſerve his turn, his knowledg is not ſo much that it ſhould put him to too great a labour in expreſſing it in the courſe of his life: For whoſoever he be that dares entertain, or give way to ſuch a thought as this is, Let him be ſure that if he do not know ſo much as God requires at his hands, (eſpecially now that God hath ſealed up the Scripture-Canon, now that the whole Will of God is revealed) this very

very ignorance alone will be a thousand weights, to fasten him on the earth, to make him sure for ever ascending to God, in whom there is no darkness at all.

48. For it is not so with an ignorant man, as it is with one that is blind, who, if he will be sure not to tempt God by venturing and rushing forward in paths unknown unto him, may live as long and as safe as he that is most quick-sighted: No, Ignorance alone, though it be not active and fruitful in works of darkness, is crime enough. For with what colour of reason will such a one expect the reward of the Just? Such a one will not doubt, but that the Gates of Heaven are barr'd against the sottish blind ignorant Heathen, to whom God never revealed any part of his Will; yet himself may fare well enough. Is not this a degree beyond madness it self? What? does such a one think, that because he lives among religious people, and such as are well acquainted with the way to Heaven, that himself shall be sure to go for company? Does he make no doubt of his part in the Resurrection of the Just, because he was born in *England*, or in such a year of our Lord when the Gospel flourished? Nay, shall it not be much more tolerable for the worst of the Heathen than for a such a man?

49. For if the Heathen were left without excuse, because they knew not God, or, if they knew him, they did not honour him as God, whereas they were only instructed by the Book of Nature: The very main Principle of all Religion, namely, That there is a God, was a business of great labour, and required a good understanding to find out, being a Conclusion to be collected and deduced from many experiments of his power, providence, and the like. Shall those hope to escape, that pretend ignorance, after they may, if they refuse it not, have use of all that ever Reason found out; nay, have before their eyes the sum and effect of all the Sermons and Instructions, that ever any Prophet or Apostle made since the world began: If after all this, there be any safety to be hop'd for from Ignorance, then have the Apostles travell'd, Christ preach'd, nay dy'd, in vain.

50. But to return to our business in hand. Knowledg, at least, in some measure there must necessarily be, else no hope of Salvation: And with Knowledge, there must of necessity be joyn'd some proportionable measure of Practise, else a greater and more insupportable burden of woe and destruction. And the reason is evident out of those words of our Saviour, *To whom much is given of him shall much be required.* We must know, that there is not any good thing in the world wherein we have any propriety; We are only Stewards, and have such things committed to our trust, and one day there will certainly be exacted a strict account. As of our riches, health, education, but much more our knowledg, and especially that knowledg, which is perfected only in practise, such is the wisdom of a Christian.

51. What reason can be imagined why God should take such pains, give such royal and precious graces to his Servants the Prophets and Apostles to enable them to make known his good will and pleasure, and what he commands us, and expects at our hands, Was all this perform'd, think we, to afford us only matter of Table-talk? Does he exhort and perswade us to hear and discourse? No surely, He gave it us to profit withal, both our selves and others. And therefore where there is a more aboundant plenty of knowledg lent us, the Bill of Account must arise proportionably, or for what is wanting in the sum, we remain debtors; and when *once the*

Cre-

Creditor catches us by the throat and casts us into Prison, there is no coming out, till all, even the uttermost Farthing, be discharg'd: he might as well have said Never, for it comes all to one end.

52. It will be worth our consideration, and very material, to press this so necessary a point, to take notice of the nature and fashion of the Judgment, which shall befal the Fool in my Text, and such companions of his, as are content to enjoy a fruitless in-effectual knowledg, how fit and suitable it is to their offence. You shall find it expressed in *Luk.* 13.25, &c. in these
Luk.13. 25. terms. *Many in that day shall begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets:* This is something more then hearing Sermons, or learning Catechisms by heart. These had heard him preach, nay,
Vers. 26. were familiarly acquainted with him, and yet in that day will get but a comfortless answer from him in the following verse, *But he shall say, I tell you, I know not whence you are; Depart from me ye workers of Iniquity.* St. *Matthew* hath it more sharply, *I never knew you.* They might else have imputed his not knowing them to the weakness of his memory: But he stops that conceit, and professes, He never knew them: *i.e.* He denies not, but he had often seen them at Sermon when he preach'd, and, it may be, he had eaten and drunk with them, yet for all this, He never knew them; they were strangers to him, he never acknowledged them to be his flock, and therefore was not bound to take notice of them: But there is one will own them, even Satan, whom before they acknowledged for their Lord; and to his Kingdom they may, nay they must, go.

53. Are not these men right serv'd? are not they justly and righteously dealt withal? They had eaten and drunk in his presence, it is true; Nay, peradventure, they had eaten him and drunk him in his Sacrament: They had oft heard him preach in their streets, and could for a need repeat a good deal of the substance of his Sermons: But, in very deed, they never knew him, nor one word that ever he spoke: that is, they took no especial notice of him, they did not acknowledg him for their Lord, neither cared they to perform any thing that he commanded. And now he is quit with them, He remembers well enough what kind of people they were, even his very Enemies and Deriders; and as he never did acknowledg them for his sheep, so neither now will he admit them into his fold. A most righteous, yet withal, a most heavy doom.

54. And here I will briefly end my other member of the First General, namely, how dangerous and heavy a burden Knowledg will be, where it is fruitless and ineffectual. Where you have heard how poor and worthless a purchase Knowledg alone is; nay, how without it, a man has scarse any title at all unto Hell, there is no guilt without it; Alone it is a good qualification, a fair towardly disposition towards our ruin. Our Saviour professes that the Pharisees themselves, (A Nation, the very proverb of perversness and infidelity) if they had been blind, *i.e.* without knowledg, they had had no sin. Yet for all this, though Knowledg be so dangerous a ware (it is something like Gunpowder; a man when he has it, must take heed how he uses it): yet this is by no means a sufficient excuse for any one utterly to neglect the purchase of it, at least, in some measure: For it is true, Knowledg not used, or ill used, will aggravate our torment, and adds even fire unto Hell: Yet withal, it is true, that an utter neglect of all Knowledg, especially, in these times of light, when it is to be had at so cheap a rate, will make

dam-

damnation as ſure to a man as the former. Now the reaſon, why Knowledg, where it is fruitleſs in practiſe, will be abundantly fruitful in torment, is taken from that maxim of our Saviour, *To whom much is given, of him ſhall much be required. i. e.* We, being only Stewards of Gods bleſſings, no proprietaries in them, muſt expect one day to give account of them all, but eſpecially Knowledg, which is a Ware of the chiefeſt Trade. Now where there are great receipts, and no disburſements, the debt muſt needs be exceeding great; and when once the Sergeant hath arreſted us for it, The Lord knows when we ſhall pay it. The laſt thing that I propos'd to your thoughts, was the ſuitableneſs of the puniſhment that will attend ſuch an offence: For the Fool, in my Text, when he would give himſelf leave to think, knew well enough that there was a God, and that all his love and ſervice was due to him: But theſe were melancholick thoughts, and ſuch as would hinder him in the proſecution of his deſign'd projects, and therefore he put them farr from him: So that, in effect, and in Gods account, he was utterly ignorant of him, did not, at all know him. Juſt ſo ſhall they be ſerved: Chriſt knows all the world better then any man knows his own heart: Yet in that great day he ſhall prove to be a very ſtranger, utterly ignorant of the greateſt part of the world, though many of them had been his acquaintance here; nay, though through faith, in his power, they had unawares by wonders and miracles, brought many to Heaven, and had been good helpers to deſtroy the Infernal Kingdom, whereof before they were in Affection, and now for ever muſt, indeed, be Inhabitants.

55. There remains the other main General, which is, indeed, the ſubſtance of the whole Text, namely, the fruit of this folly, and that is, Atheiſm, not in opinion, but practiſe: In the proſecution whereof, I ſhall mainly inſiſt upon this, to demonſtrate, by infallible deductions out of Gods Word, that men who profeſs Religion, and a perfect Knowledg of God, yet whiles they allow him only the Brain, and not (what he only deſires) the Heart and Affections, may prove, in Gods account, very Atheiſts. Or, to bring it neerer home, I will ſhew how that many, the ordinary courſes, and the moſt incontrouled practiſes, of men of this age do utterly contradict, and formally deſtroy the very Foundations and Principles of the glorious Religion which they profeſs. But this will require a much longer time then your patience can allow me: Therefore I will only add ſome few words of Application, of what hath been ſpoken, and ſo conclude.

56. That Jewel which our Saviour ſo magnifies, (*Matth.* 13.) and ſo commends the wiſdom of the Merchant for ſelling all, even utterly undoing himſelf to purchaſe it, is the Goſpel of the Kingdom of Heaven. Which though it be of moſt precious and ineſtimable value, worthy the ſelling of the whole world to buy it, yet is every mans money, every man has riches enough to adventure upon it, ſo he will but ſell all that he has, ſo he will be content to turn bankrupt for it, and upon no other terms can he have it.

57. That advice which Chriſt gave the rich young man, that had a good mind to follow him, *viz.* that he ſhould ſell all that he had, and take up his Croſs, was not any extraordinary unuſual tryal, but we have all accepted the ſame offer upon the very ſame conditions: We muſt of neceſſity ſell all, deny and renounce the keeping and poſſeſſing of any thing beſides this Pearl; We muſt even ſell our ſelves, deny and renounce our own ſouls, they are both become Gods own, and we are but borrowers of them: Now if we be

not

not Masters of our goods,nor of our selves,neither then may we do our own actions,we must not think our own thoughts. They were such Fools as this great notorious one in my Text, who in *Psal.* 12. say, *Our tongues are our own, we may say what we list.* We are all bought with a price;yea all that we have,is bought.

58. Yet though we must sell all, and deny our own selves, yet we need not part with our goods,or riches,we need not make away our selves. For example:when our Saviour says,*He that hateth not Father and Mother, and Brethren,and Sisters*, and all the world besides, *for my Names sake, and the Gospels, is not worthy of me*:This speech does not bind me to hate,persecute, and destroy all the kindred I have ; no,but rather to love and honor them, to spend,and be spent for them: Yet if those persons, or if it be possible for ought else, to be more dear and precious then they,stand in my way to hinder me from coming to Christ ; then it is time for me to hate them, then I must trample them under my feet. So that a man is no more bound to sell his Goods,that is, to throw them away, than he is to hate his Parents; Only neither of them may by any means offend us , or annoy us, in our journey to Christ.

59. Now to bring this home to our purpose. Can any face be so impudent,as to profess he hath already sold all,himself to boot , and is ready to part with them when God shal call for them,who contents himself only with knowing and hearing Stories of him, and reserves his heart to his own use, which is all that God requires? Can he with any reason in the world be said to sell all for the Gospel of Christ , that sees Christ himself every day almost hungry,and does not feed him; naked,and does not clothe him ; in prison,and does not visit him? For in asmuch as they do not these offices of Charity to his beloved little ones, they deny them to him. Will he be found to be worthy of Christ,that for his sake will not renounce one delightful sin, which a Heathen would easily have done , only for the empty reward of fame ? That for his sake will not forgive his Brother some small injury received ; nay, perhaps some great kindness offered as a seasonable reproof, or loving dissuasion, from sinning ? That for his sake will not undergo the least trouble in furthering his own Salvation ?

60. Far from us(beloved Christians) be so barren a Profession,a Profession having only the vizzard and *form of Godliness,but denying the power thereof.* No let us with thankful hearts,and tongues,recount and consider,what God hath done for our souls,how he hath given us his Word , abundantly sufficient to instruct us. How he hath spoke the word,and great is the multitude of Preachers. Yet withal,let us consider,that it is in our power to turn these unvaluable Treasures of Gods favors into horrible curses. Let us consider how God hath sent out his Word,& it will not return unto him empty,it wil be effectual one way or other,it will perform some great work in us. God doth but expect what entertainment it finds upon earth, and will proportion a reward accordingly on them which detain the truth;in unrighteousness he will rain snares,fire,and brimstone: But to such as with meek hearts,& due reverence *receive it into good ground*,and express the power thereof in their lives,there remaineth an exceeding eternal weight of Joy and Glory. *Let us therefore walk as children of the light*;and not content our selves with a bare empty Profession of Religion : *Let him that* but *nameth the Name of the Lord,depart from Iniquity.* Brethren,consider what I say,and the Lord give you understanding in all things. *To God*,&c.

The

The Third Sermon.

Psalm XIV. 1.

The Fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God.

I Will not be aſhamed to be ſo farr my own Plagiary, as, for your ſakes, that you may be the better able to go along with me in what remains of this Text, briefly to diſcover unto you, how farr I have already, in another Auditory, proceeded in it.

2. Firſt therefore, I conceived (by attending to the courſe and ſeries of the Pſalm, and by comparing this place with many others in Holy Scripture in different language, expreſſing the ſame ſenſe) That this Fool, in my Text, was not a man utterly ignorant and devoid of the knowledg of God, and his Word; For he is ſuppos'd by the Pſalmiſt, to be a man living within the pale of the Church, and outwardly profeſſing the true Religion and Worſhip of God: And thereupon, Secondly, That his Atheiſm was no Heatheniſh, Philoſop ical Atheiſm, no problematical maintaining an opinion, That *there is no God*, For even among the very Heathens, we read not of above three or four, of any account, which have proceeded to this excelling degree and height of Impiety. 1.

3. But this Perſon (whether *Doeg* the *Edomite*, or whoſoever he were), is ſuch a one, as though, in his Profeſſion, and even ſerious thoughts, he do not queſtion a Deity, but would be a mortal Enemy to any one, who ſhould dare to deprive and rob Almighty God of any of his Glorious Attributes: Notwithſtanding in his Heart, (that is, in the phraſe of the Scripture) in the propenſion and inclination of his Affections, and by conſequence, in the courſe and practiſe of his life, he denies and renounces God: He accounts the ſpending a little time in thinking and meditating on the Providence, or Mercy, or Severity of God, to be an employment very ungainful and diſadvantageous to him, a buſineſs likely to trouble and ſpoil many of his ungodly projects, and to hinder him in his fortunes: And for this reaſon, he will put God farr away from him; He will not ſuffer him to be (as the Pſalmiſt ſaith, Pſal. 10. 4.) *in all his crafty purpoſes.* 2. Pſal. 10. 4.

4. I

4. I yet willingly confeſs, that this, *Saying in the Heart, There is no God,* may reaſonably be interpreted to be a ſecret whiſpering ſuggeſtion, an inward perſwaſion, by fits, which a wretched worldling may have, that, ſince he has thrived ſo well by his careleſneſs in obſerving Gods Word, and obſtinate oppoſing himſelf to his will, it may be poſſible there is indeed no God at all; or, if there be, that he will not vouchſafe to deſcend ſo low, as to take notice what is done here on earth, or to obſerve how each particular perſon behaves himſelf in this life. Now; becauſe I will not ſet up one of theſe Expoſitions againſt the other, I will hereafter, as occaſion ſhall offer it ſelf, make uſe of them both.

5. Having therefore conceived the ſenſe of the Text to be ſuch as I have
1. now told you; In the words I obſerved two General Parts. Firſt, the cauſe of Atheiſm, and, by conſequence, all the abominations following through the whole Pſalm, intimated in the perſon *Nabal*, i. e. *The Fool*, which is, Folly; *i.e.* Ignorance, or rather, Incogitancy, Inconſideration.
2. Secondly, The effect of this Folly, which, is Atheiſm, and that ſeated not in the Brain, but in the Heart or Affections. I have already gone through the former part, namely, the cauſe of Atheiſm, which is Folly: in the proſecution whereof, I endeavoured to diſcover, wherein this Folly doth conſiſt. And that is not ſo much in an utter ignorance of God, and his Holy Word, as a not making a good uſe of it, when it is known, a ſuffering it to ly dead, to ſwim unprofitably in the Brain, without any fruit thereof in the reformation of a mans life and converſation. And there I ſhow-
1. ed, firſt, what extream folly it was for a man to ſeek to encreaſe the knowledg of his Maſters will, without a reſolution to encreaſe proportionably in a ſerious active performance thereof. And ſecondly, the extream unavoidable danger and encreaſe of guilt, which knowledg, without practiſe, brings with it. To both which Conſiderations, I ſeverally annexed Applications to the Conſciences of them that heard me, and ſhould have proceeded to ---

6. The Second General Part: which is the effect and fruit of the folly, or inconſideration of *Nabal*, *(the Fool)* in my Text, which is Atheiſm practical, not of the Underſtanding, but the Will and Affections. But, the time being ſpent in the proſecution of the former General Part, I was forced to reſerve this Second General, to be the employment of another Hour.

7. Only thus much, I then made promiſe of, (which debt I purpoſe now to diſcharge to you) namely, To demonſtrate by infallible deductions out of Gods Word, that many, who profeſs Religion, and a perfect knowledg of Gods Word, yet whiles they allow him only the Brain, and not (what he almoſt only requires) the Heart, and Affections, may prove in Gods account very Atheiſts. Or to bring it nearer home, I promiſed to ſhew, how that many the ordinary courſes, and moſt incontrouled practiſes of men of this age, do utterly contradict, and formally deſtroy the very Foundations and Principles of that glorious Religion which they profeſs. Of theſe, *&c.*

8. At the firſt ſight, indeed, a man would think, that of all the places in Holy Scripture, and of all the ages which have been ſince the world began, That this Text, and theſe times, ſhould ſuit worſt together: For firſt, if a man would ſtrive with all the earneſtneſs, and even ſpite, he could, in all the abomi-
nable

nable odious colours to describe the worst of all humane creatures, even the Idolatrous, self-devouring *Indians*. What more horrible expression could he imagin to himself, then to call them Fools, and such *Fools, who say in their Heart, There is no God.* Again, if we shall enquire and ask the former Ages, if ever the world was so stored, and even oppressed with knowledg: They will tell us, That the Light was never a burden, nor Knowledg a vice before now: Never till now did all sorts and conditions of men pretend to be able to state the most intricate profound questions of our Religion. Never till now was *Moses* his wish fulfilled, *I would to God, that all the people of the Lord were Prophets:* though in a sense which would scarce have pleased him.

9. These things considered, were it not fit (think you), that I should renounce my Text, or travel to find out a Nation whom it may concern, and who have need to hear Atheists condemned? I would to God, (my Beloved Brethren), that whatsoever I shall speak against that fearful sin of Atheism, may prove vain unprofitable words, words which may return empty, having found none to fasten upon: I would to God, that I might strive now, as one that beateth the air, so that you, (even you, who know so much) were innocent. But *David* found this a Doctrin fit to be pressed in his days, which were none of the worst neither: Yea, he hath a second time, (in *Psal.* 51.) almost *in terminis terminantibus*, repeated whatsoever he here speaks of the Atheist: We find not such an example through the whole Scripture, (except it be in a History, or where the quotation is mentioned.) Therefore surely it may be pertinent, and sometimes useful even in the Church to have Atheism discovered, to have this Doctrin preach'd and re-preach'd: it was so in *David*'s times: and it shall go hard, but we shall shew, that we our selves, (though never so wise and learn'd and knowing in our own opinion): yet that we also ought not to take it to heart, if sometimes we be suspected and challenged of Atheism:

10. That Temptation which the Devil found hard enough for himself, even when he was an Angel of Light, namely, *Ero similis Altissimo; I shall be like the most Highest:* Now that it is his Office, and employment, to become a Tempter, He has since scarce ever varied: At the first exercise of his Trade, with his first customers, *Adam* and *Eve*, he begun with it, *Ye shall be as Gods, knowing Good and Evil.* And if we shall unpartially examin our own thoughts, we shall find almost in every suggestion, at least, some degree and tincture of Atheism: either we do exalt and Deifie our own selves, or else we do dishonour, and, in a manner, degrade Almighty God, deposing him from that soveraignty and sway which he ought to exercise in our Hearts and Consciences.

11. This, I say, is true in some measure, in all temptations, in all sins whatsoever, there is some quantity of Atheism, though the sins be but of an ordinary size and rank: But this is not that which I would now stand upon: It concerns me, to show, that though men be never so Orthodox in their Opinions, though they pretend to never so much zeal of the Truth, which they profess, yet unless that Divine Truth be powerful and perswasive enough to the performance and practise of such Duties, as bear a natural resemblance and proportion unto it: They that make such a Profession of Gods Truth, do but flatter themselves, they only think they

believe, but indeed, and in truth, there is no such thing as Faith in them. For, we must know, that there is no Divine Truth so utterly speculative, but that there naturally and infallibly flows and results from it (as necessarily as warmth from light) a Duty to be practis'd and put in execution: Insomuch, that it is impossible for a man to be truly perswaded of the one,
1 Joh 2. 4. but he shall infallibly be perswaded to the other: So that *he which saith, He knoweth God, and keepeth not his Commandements, is a Lyar, and the Truth is not in him.* And this I shall endeavour to confirm by Induction, examining the truth and reality of our assent to the chief Fundamental Points of our Religion, by our practises answerable thereto, and concluding, that where the latter is not to be found, it is but a vain perswasion and phantastical illusion for a man to think he hath the former.

12. But in the first place, that we may be the better able, and without interruption proceed in this design'd course, I will first remove an Objection, which may seem to prevail against that which hath been spoken:
Object. to this effect: *The Devils* (as Saint *James* saith), *believe and tremble*:
Jam. 11. 19. They do indeed assent unto the Truth of all the mysteries of our Salvation: In the place of St. *James*, they acknowledg One God: In *Matth.* 8. 28. they acknowledg the second Article of our Faith, allowing Christ to be Son of God. And the like may be said of the others following; And yet if we examin their practise: How absolutely contradicting and warring is it with their profession? Therefore, it may seem, that where there is a firm assent to Divine Truths, there may consist with it a contrary repugnant practise.

Sol. 13. For answer therefore we must know, that the Assent which the Devil gives to the Revelations of God, is extreamly different from that belief which is exacted of us Christians, and which every one of us, (though never so vitious and irreligious) would gladly perswade our selves that we allow unto Gods Word: For though, for example, the Devils acknowledge the Precepts and Commandements of God to be Holy, and Just, and Good, and most fit to be observed; As likewise that to those who sincerely, and without Hypocrisie, shall perform these
Heb. 11. 1. Commandements of God, the promises of God shall be *Yea and Amen*, they shall infallibly attain those joys which exceed mans understanding to comprehend: Yet, these things to them are only as a Tale which is told; or rather they are to them occasion of horrour and gnashing of Teeth, that there should be such glorious comfortable things, which do nothing concern them, and of malice and hatred to those who have an interest in them, and are in a fair possibility of attaining unto them: And therefore no marvail if such a Faith as this be barren and unfruitful of Good Works. Whereas *our Faith* (saith St. *Paul*) *is the substance of things hoped for*, of things which concern us, we do not only acknowledg, that the Precepts of God are good, but also necessarily to be performed by us: and that the promises of God are not only desireable in themselves, but also that being such, they were revealed for our sakes, and are infallibly destin'd unto us, when we shall have performed such conditions as may by the assistance of God be executed by us, even with ease and pleasure: Now whersoever such perswasions as these are, it is impossible (even if the Devils themselves could be supposed capable of them) but that there should accompany them earnest and serious endeavours not to come

short

ſhort of the Glory of God. This difficulty therefore being diſſolved, I ſhall perſue the examination of our belief of the Foundations of our Religion, by the fruits and iſſues of it in the practiſes of our lives.

14. We will begin with ſome of Gods Attributes: Whoſoever thou art, that profeſſeſt thy ſelf a Chriſtian, thou believeſt, that God whom thou ſerveſt is preſent every where, both in Heaven and Earth, inſomuch, that it is altogether impoſſible for thee to exclude him from thy company; whereſoever thou goeſt, he will purſue thee: Though thou ſhouldſt cloath thy ſelf with darkneſs, as it were with a garment, the darkneſs would be to Him as the Noon-day: And though it were poſſible for thee to deceive the eyes and obſervation of Men and Angels, yea, even of thine own Conſcience, yet to him thou wouldſt be open and tranſparent; γυμὸς καὶ ἐπτερχηλισμένος, as it were, Diſſected, and having thy very Entrails expoſed to his ſight.

15. Thou canſt hide therefore nothing which thou doeſt from his eyes, he taketh notice of every word which thou ſpeakeſt, he hears even the very whiſpering of thy thoughts: And all this, thou ſayeſt, thou acknowledgeſt. Out of thy own mouth ſhalt thou be condemned, thou wicked Servant: Dareſt thou then make thy Maſter a witneſs of thy Rebellion and Diſobedience? When thou art about the fulfilling of any of thine ungodly luſts, thou retireſt thy ſelf from company, and art afraid of the faces of men; thou abhorreſt the light: And yet dareſt out-face him whoſe Eyes are ten thouſand times brighter then the Sun. Thou wouldeſt not have the confidence to commit filthineſs, if thy friend were in company: And yet, what injury is done to him by it? what Commandement of his doeſt thou tranſgreſs in it? Or if thou didſt, What power, or authority, has he over thee to puniſh thee? Thou wouldeſt be aſhamed to commit ſuch a ſin, if thy Servant were by, one whom thou art ſo farr from being afraid of, that himſelf, his words, almoſt his very thoughts, are in thy power: Nay, if a child were in company, thou wouldſt not have the face to do it.

16. Thou canſt not deny, but reſpect to a friend, to a ſervant, even to a child, will with-hold thee from ſuch practiſes, and yet withall confeſſeſt, that Almighty God, whom thou profeſſeſt, to ſerve, to fear, and to love, that he all the while looks upon thee, and obſerves thee; his Eyes are never removed from thee, and which is worſe, though thou mayeſt endeavour to forget, and blot, ſuch actions out of thy remembrance, yet it is impoſſible he ſhould ever forget them: He keeps a Regiſter of all thy ſins, which no time ſhall ever be able to deface: And what will it then profit thee to live a cloſe conceal'd ſinner from the world, or to gain amongſt men the reputation of a devout religious Chriſtian, when in the mean time thine own Heart and Conſcience ſhall condemn thee; Nay, when Almighty *God who is greater then thy Heart, and knoweth all things*, when he ſhall be able to object unto thee all thy cloſe ungodly projects, all thy boſome private luſts; yea, when that conceit (wherein thou didſt ſo much pleaſe thy ſelf) of being able to delude and blind the obſervation of the World ſhall nothing avail thee, but whatſoever miſchiefs thou haſt contrived in thy Cloſet; whatſoever abominations thou haſt practiſed in thy Bed; all theſe, with each aggravating Circumſtance, ſhall be diſ-

covered in the preſence of all men, and Angels, and Devils: when Satan, whom before thou madeſt an Inſtrument and Bawd unto thy luſts, to whoſe counſels and ſuggeſtions thou before would'ſt only hearken, ſhall be the moſt forward and eager to appeach thee.

17. When thou art brought to ſuch an exigent as this (which, without a timely unfeigned repentance, as ſure as there is a God in Heaven, thou ſhalt at laſt be brought to) what will then thy orthodox opinions do thee good? what will it then profit thee, to ſay, Thou never didſt maintain any impious diſhonourable Tenents concerning God, or any of his glorious Attributes? Yea, how happy hadſt thou been, if worſe than the moſt ignorant heatheniſh Atheiſt, no thought or conſideration of God had entred into thy heart? For this profeſſing thy ſelf a Chriſtian rightly inſtructed in the knowledge of God, will prove heavier to thee than a thouſand milſtones hanged about thy neck, to ſink thee into the bottome of that comfortleſs Lake of fire and brimſtone? For, for example: What a ſtrange plea would it be, for a Murderer to ſay, I confeſs I have committed ſuch or ſuch a murder; but all the excuſe which I can alledge for my ſelf, is, that I was well ſtudied in the Laws which forbad murder, and I knew that my Judge who tyed me to the obſervance of this Law, upon pain of death, was preſent, and obſerv'd me when I commited the Fact: Surely it would be more tolerable for him to ſay, I never heard of any ſuch Law or Judge; or if I have been told of ſuch things, I gave but little heed to the report, I did not at all believe it. For though this plea will be very inſufficient to acquit the malefactor; yet it will be much more advantageous than the former: for what were that, but to flout the Judge to his face, and to pretend a reſpectful worthy opinion of him, for this end, that his contempt and negligence in performing his Commandements, may be more extream and inexcuſable; and by conſequence, without all hope or expectation of pardon. I need make no application of the example, the Similitude doth ſufficiently apply it ſelf.

18. Therefore if I were to adviſe any man who is reſolved by his practice to contradict that opinion which he ſaith he hath of God; or, that is not reſolved to live with that reverence and awfulneſs due to the Majeſty of Almighty God, in whoſe preſence he alwaies is; I would counſel him not to believe himſelf, when he profeſſes the Omnipreſence, or Omniſcience of God: For without all contradiction, though by living in a Nation where every one with whom he converſes, profeſſeth ſo much, he may have learned to ſay, There is a God, and that this God is every where preſent; and takes particular notice of whatſoever is done in heaven and earth: yet if this Notion were firmly rooted in his ſoul, as a matter of Religion, as a buſineſs upon which depends the everlaſting welfare of his ſoul and body; it is altogether impoſſible for him to continue in an habitual practice of ſuch things as are evidently repugnant and deſtructive to ſuch a conceit. For tell me, Would any man in his right ſenſes, when he ſhall ſee another drink down a poyſon which he knows will ſuddenly prove mortal unto him; I ſay, will any man be ſo mad as to believe ſuch a one, though he ſhould, with all the moſt earneſt proteſtations that can be imagined, profeſs that he is not weary of his life, but intends to prolong it as long as God and Nature will give him leave?

19. The

19. The Case is altogether in each point and circumstance the same: For he which saith, He believeth or assenteth to any doctrine, as a fundamental point of his Religion, intends thus much by it, that he has bound himself in certain bonds unto Almighty God (for so the very name of Religion doth import) to expect no benefit at all from him, but upon condition of believing such divine Truths as it shall please him to reveal unto him, namely, as means and helps of a devout religious life and worship of him: For God reveals nothing of himself to any man for this end, to satisfie his curiosity, or to afford him matter of discourse or news; but to instruct him how he may behave himself here in this life, that he may attain those promises which shall be fulfilled to those who sincerely and devoutly serve and obey him.

20. Therefore he that shall say, I believe such a Truth revealed by God, and yet lives as if he had never heard of such a thing; yea, as if he had been perswaded of the contrary; is as much to be believed, as if he should say, I will drink a deadly poyson to quench my thirst, or will stab my self to the heart, for physick, to let out superfluous bloud: So that that man who is not resolved to break off his wicked courses by repentance, and conversion unto God; that lives as if the Devil only were every where, and he resolved to please and delight him with his ungodly life; let not such a one use himself to say, I believe that God is alwaies present with me, and a spectator of my actions; for thereby, he shall only add a lye to the rest of his sins, and fewel to the lake of fire and brimstone: He shall never perswade God to believe him, that he was of such an opinion; but that whatsoever his tongue said, and his fancy now and then apprehended, yet in his conscience he was alwaies a constant resolved Atheist, and *in his heart he said, There is no God.*

21. In the second place, thou acknowledgest, that God whom thou professest obedience to, is infinitely Righteous; insomuch that it is impossible that he should not hate and abhorre unrighteousness in whomsoever he finds it: Yea, so natural and essential is his Justice unto him, that he should deny himself, if he should accept any mans person, if he should not be avenged on sin, if he should not most severely punish it. Thou canst not be ignorant how many vowes and protestations he hath made almost every where through the Holy Scripture, of his hatred and indignation against sin, insomuch, that heaven and earth may pass away, but not one jot or tittle of those curses and plagues shall fall to the ground, which he hath denounced against impenitent sinners.

22. And shall not thy own mouth here once again condemn thee, O thou wicked servant? Darest thou then every hour wilfully, and even contentedly do such things, as must certainly procure his anger and indignation against thee for ever? Wilt thou, for the sinful pleasure of a few minutes, put thy self in such a condition, that God must of necessity be angry with thee; that he must cease to be God, unless he hate and abhorre thee? Certainly, if thou wouldest descend into thine own heart, if thou wouldest give thy self leave carefully and unpartially to examine thy thoughts, thou wouldest find that thy tongue has given thy soul the lye, when it hath told thee, that God is immutably Just and righteous; and yet for all that, that thou art resolved to run on in such

courſes, as muſt of neceſſity pull down his heavy diſpleaſure againſt thee.

23. At leaſt, thou wilt find in thy heart earneſt deſires and wiſhes, that God were not ſo righteous as Preachers tell thee he is! Oh, thinkeſt thou in thy heart, that God were ſuch an unrighteous perſon as I am! Oh, that he could be content to wink at me, when I am about the fulfilling of my ungodly deſires! Alas, what harm is it to him, what inconvenience accrews to him by it, if I enjoy the ſinful pleaſures of this life? Or if he will needs be angry, Oh that it were not in his power to revenge himſelf upon me! Oh that his power were not ſo unlimited as (they ſay) it is!

24. I know men will be apt to flatter themſelves, though they be never ſo vicious, and to think that they are extremely wronged, to have ſuch imputations laid upon them. They will be ready to anſwer me, in the words of *Hazael* to the Prophet *Eliſha*, when he told him what horrible maſſacres he ſhould commit among the *Iſraelites*, when he ſhould have the Crown of *Syria* ſet on his head: *What doeſt thou think us dogs, that we ſhould do ſuch things as theſe?* We are ſo far from robbing God of his Juſtice, that we would be mortal enemies to any that dare proceed to that height of impiety: Nay, we would be content to ſacrifice our own lives, rather than be brought to deny that, or any other of his glorious Attributes.

25. Truly, I am ſo charitably minded, as to think that there is none ſo wicked, but would confidently make this defence for himſelf; yea, and believes he is in earneſt when he ſpeaks ſo. But this will not ſerve the turn: For, *God ſeeth not as man ſees*, he judgeth not as man judgeth, but he judgeth righteous judgment. For inſtance, in that great example which our Saviour gives of the faſhion and courſe of judgment, according to which he purpoſes to proceed in the laſt day; He accuſes the wicked, and condemns them for neglect of viſiting, and feeding, and cloathing, Him. The Apology which they make for themſelves, as having never ſeen him in that exigence, would not be taken: For, though I am perſwaded they there ſpake nothing but what they verily thought, namely, that if ever they had ſeen Chriſt himſelf in ſuch want and neceſſity, they would not have been ſo hard-hearted to him, as they were to his poor ſervants: yet Chriſt will not allow of that excuſe, but accounts of their uncharitableneſs to afflicted Chriſtians, as directed to himſelf.

26. So likewiſe in the Caſe in hand. Though I believe it would be hard to perſwade even the moſt licentious profeſſed ſinner, that he believes not indeed the Juſtice and righteouſneſs of God; yet he ſhall find at laſt, and that miſerably to his coſt, that God who knows his heart much better than himſelf, for all his profeſſions, will yet eſteem him an Atheiſt; and will prove evidently and convincingly unto him, that ſince that knowledge which he pretended to have of Gods Righteouſneſs, had been ſo fruitleſs and ſuperficial, that notwithſtanding ſuch a conceit, he proceeded ſtill on in his ungodly courſes; that therefore he did but delude himſelf all the while with phantaſtical ungrounded illuſions; ſo that whatſoever imagination ſwim in his brain, yet in the language of his heart, that is, in the propenſion and ſway of his affections, he ſaid, *There*

is no God — Now what hath been ſaid of the Omnipreſence, Infinite Knowledge, and Juſtice of God, may by the ſame reaſon and proportion, be ſpoken of the reſt of his glorious Attributes. But the ſtraitneſs of time will force me to leave the reſt untouched: I will proceed therefore to make the like collections from one or two Articles more of the Creed.

27. Thou believeſt that after this life (which cannot laſt very long, it will, and that ſhortly, have an end) there remain but two waies for all men of what ſtate and condition ſoever that ever were, to be diſpoſed of, either into life and glory everlaſting, or elſe into pains and torments infinite and inſupportable. And by conſequence, that thy ſoul is an immortal ſubſtance, which ſhall for ever continue ſomewhere: and according to thy behaviour here, during that ſhort meaſure of time which thou liveſt upon the earth, it muſt expect a reward proportionable thereto. If thou canſt perſwade thy ſelf to walk worthy of that calling whereunto thou art called in Jeſus Chriſt: If thou wilt not forſwear and renounce that glorious profeſſion which thou madeſt in thy Baptiſm: If thou canſt be content to ſubmit thy ſelf to the eaſie yoke of Chriſt, propoſe to thy ſelf what reward thou canſt imagine, give thy thoughts ſcope and licence to be exceſſive and overflowing in their deſires; if thou art not ſatisfied to the uttermoſt, infinitely above what thou art now able to comprehend, Tell God he is a liar, and has deceived thee. Oh what unſpeakable joyes ſhall hereafter expect thee? Oh with what a burden and weight of glory ſhalt thou even be oppreſſed?

28. But on the other ſide; If notwithſtanding ſuch ineſtimable bleſſings as are now ſet before thine eyes, thou art yet reſolved to content thy ſelf with ſuch vain trifling pleaſures as thou canſt meet with in this life, which yet thou canſt not attain to, but with as much pains, and anxiety, and care; as, if rightly applied, would have been ſufficient to have procured heaven for thee! What ſhall I ſay unto thee? only this, *Thou haſt thy reward: Remember that thou haſt already received thy good things.* What a terrible affrighting ſpeech is this? It may be thou haſt fed and glutted thy luſts with ſome pleaſures of this life; it may be thou haſt ſatisfied in ſome ſmall meaſure thy ambition with honour and preferment; and yet it may be, for all thy cares and travels, thou haſt not been able to attain to any of thoſe things as thou didſt deſire; whether thou haſt or haſt not, it is all one, there is little to chuſe, but howſoever, *Remember that thou haſt received thy good things*; Remember, *thou haſt thy reward.* Do not hereafter preſume to offer to pretend to any the leaſt good from God. It may be hereafter thou mayeſt come to ſuch want, as to ſtand in need of a cup of cold water; any, it may be thou wouldeſt think thy ſelf happy, if any body would afford thee but one drop of water to refreſh thy tongue. But in vain: for, *Son, Remember thou haſt already received thy good things.* Thou never ſaweſt beggar ſo utterly wretched and deſtitute, but he might almoſt every where have filled himſelf with water, and have thanked no body for it: and yet though thou ſhouldeſt even conſume thy ſelf with intreating, and crying for it, yet none ſhall be found to give it thee, even thy liberal good father *Abraham* will deny it to thee.

29. Surely

29. Surely there cannot be found ſo impudent, ſo unreaſonable a ſinner, as to profeſs he is fully perſwaded of theſe things, and that he hath a deſire, and even ſome hope, that God will be ſo merciful to him, as to perſerve him, that none of thoſe things happen unto him, and yet reſolve to follow the devices of his own heart: To ſay, He acknowledgeth that the joyes which are reſerved for penitent believers, are ſo exceſſively glorious, that the afflictions of this life are not worthy of them, much leſs the vain pleaſures thereof; and yet withal, rather then not enjoy the *pleaſures of ſin for a ſeaſon*, to make himſelf uncapable of thoſe great bleſſings. Such a generation of men I find in holy Scripture, and God himſelf takes notice of them, who ſay, *We ſhall have peace, though we walk in the imaginations of our heart:* But withal, I can ſcarce meet with God ſo impatient through the whole Bible, as he is with people of ſuch a temper as this, *Surely the Lord will be avenged on ſuch a nation as this, and will make his fierce wrath to ſmoak againſt them.*

30. Therefore, whomſoever thou art that haſt taken up thy reſolution, to walk in the imagination of thine own heart; at leaſt, take ſo much pity of thy ſelf, do not thou thy ſelf add violence and heat to the wrath of God, which ſhall ſmoak againſt thee, by pretending to a belief of Heaven or Hell, or by ſeeming to profeſs, that all the while that thou art buſie in the proſecution of thine ungodly luſts, notwithſtanding that, all that time, this opinion hath never left thee, *That God will bring thee to Judgment*; That even that very body of thine, which thou mad'ſt a manſion for the Devil, an inſtrument for any wickedneſs that he would ſuggeſt unto thee, yet that that body ſhould be raiſed up; that to thy extream horror and aſtoniſhment, God would take ſuch particular care of that very body of thine, that whereſoever it were loſt, he would recover it, though diſperſed to the four winds of heaven, and build it up again (thou ſayeſt thou knoweſt for what uſe) even to be a mark againſt which he will empty his quivers, and ſhoot out all darts of his fiery indignation, in the puniſhing of whom he will expreſs his Almighty Power.

31. But I cannot allow my ſelf any longer time to proſecute the former part of my Propoſition, *viz.* to ſhew how much men deceive themſelves, who think they indeed believe the fundamental points of their Faith, when by their practice and courſe of life, they live in an habitual exerciſe of ſuch ſins, as are utter repugnant and deſtructive to ſuch a belief: And this, I think, I have performed; but yet only in general terms, not deſcending to a view of ſome more eminent and particular ſins and enormities: For that, therefore, which remains of the time that your patience will allow me, I will ſpend it in acquitting my ſelf of the other part of my promiſe, namely, in inſtancing in ſome extraordinary incontrouled practiſes of theſe times; and, diſcovering how utterly they do deſtroy the very grounds and foundations of our Religion, and how impoſſible it is they ſhould conſiſt with a true ſincere profeſſion of Chriſtianity.

1. 32. As firſt, for example; How ordinarily do we meet with this practice, for men which are above others in wealth and power, to employ both theſe to their utmoſt abilities, for the maintaining of an unjuſt cauſe againſt a poor inferiour adverſary: I am ſure, This is no news to you, you do not ſtartle at the hearing of ſuch a crime as this: And yet, if it be well conſidered, what can be imagined more monſtrous and abominable? For,

give

give me leave to ſuppoſe, or put the caſe, that ſome one of this company were guilty of this ſin.

33. If I ſhould ask him, Whence and from whom he had his riches or power? whom he would acknowledge for his benefactour? I make no queſtion, but he would give me a good religious Anſwer, and ſay, That *he would not ſacrifice to his net, nor burn incenſe to his dragge*; but that God, who gave a bleſſing to his cares and endeavours, had advanced him to ſuch a place and fortunes in the world. Again, if I ſhould ask him, In what eſteem and valew (he thought that) God holds his faithful ſervants? or, Whether he would take it well, to have them oppreſſed and trampled on on by others more potent then themſelves? He muſt needs anſwer again, That God is no Accepter of perſons, neither riches nor poverty are a means to procure His favour, but that in all conditions of men, *He that loveth righteouſneſs, and hateth iniquity, ſhall be accepted by him.*

34. If theſe be his Anſwers (as, without all contradiction, unleſs he will profeſs himſelf an Atheiſt, ſuch muſt be the effect of them;) Then, let him conſider, in what a woful condition he has concluded himſelf to be in, and, what reaſon he has to thank God for his honour or riches? Does he think, that God has furniſhed him with ſtrength and weapons for this end, that thereby he might be able to make warr with himſelf, that he might have the power to overrun and lay waſt thoſe whom God loveth as the apple of his own eye? Can he imagine, that God has been ſo beneficial and liberal to him, in preferring him to a rank and degree above others not inferiour to him in the riches and treaſures of God's grace, and therefore as dear unto him as himſelf; for this end, that thereby he may prove a more able, and fit inſtrument for the Devil to wreak his malice and hatred upon thoſe whom God loves?

35. Therefore, if there be ere ſuch a perſon in this Auditory (yet I hope there is not); but and if there be! What ſhall I ſay unto him? Let him conſider, what a hard task he has undertaken to warr againſt God? Let him conſider, what a ſtrange reckoning he is likely to make unto God, when he ſhall at laſt (as undoubtedly he will) require of him an account of his Stewardſhip? Behold, Lord, thou haſt given me five talents, and what have I done with them? why, lo, I have made them ten talents. But how, by what courſes? Why, I have unjuſtly and injuriouſly robbed and wrung from my fellow ſervants, thoſe few talents which thou gaveſt them: I have gain'd thus much by my violent maintaining of a cauſe which thou hatedſt, and which my ſelf could not deny but to be moſt unjuſt: This is ſurely a ſore evil under the ſun. But, ſince, I hope, it little concerns any one here, to have ſuch a crime as this diſſected curiouſly and purpoſely inſiſted upon, it ſhall ſuffice me to ſay, That they who are guilty of it, are farr from knowing of what ſpirit they are, when they ſay, they are Chriſtians, ſince even a very Heathen would abhorr to counnance or entertain ſuch a vice as this.

36. In the ſecond place, *How can ye believe* (ſaith Chriſt) *who ſeek honour one of another, and not that honour which is of God?* If theſe words Chriſt be true, That they who too earneſtly deſire applauſe and reputation among men, neglecting, in the mean time, ſeriouſly to endeavour the attaining to the honour which is of God; that is, obedience and ſubmiſſion to his Commands, which is that wherein a Chriſtian ought eſpecially to 2.

place

place his honour and reputation: If such men as these, do in vain, and without all ground of reason, reckon themselves in the number of true believers: Again, if the chief badge and σημεῖον, whereby Christ would have his servants to be distinguished from the world, be a willingness to suffer injuries, a desire rather to have the other cheek strucken, and to have the cloak go the same way with the coat, than to revenge one blow with another, or to go to Law for a matter of no great moment, for recovering of that which a man might well enough lose, without endangering his Estate.

Ezek. 9. 5, 6. 37. If these things, I say, be true; Suppose Christ (according to the vision of *Ezekiel*) should command his Angels utterly *to slay through all Jerusalem*, that is, the Church, *old and young, maids, and little children, and women, excepting only those upon whom his mark and badge were to be found*; what destruction and desolation would there be? How would the Sanctuary of God be defiled, and his Courts be filled with the slain? How would many (who now pass, both in their own and other mens opinions, for good Christians enough) be taken for *Mahomets* servants whose Religion it is, by fury and murther, to gain Proselytes to their abominable profession: Suppose our garments should be presented to God with the same question that *Jacob's* Sons sent their Brother *Joseph's*, *Num hæc est tunica filii tui? Is this thy sons coat?* Would they not rather be taken for the skins of savadge Beasts, so unlike are they to that garment of Humility and Patience which our Saviour wore, and which he bequeathed us in his Legacy.

38. We are so far from seeking that Honour which is of God, from endeavouring to attain unto, or so much as countenancing such virtues, which God hath often professed, that he will exalt and glorifie; such is humility and patiently bearing of injuries, that we place our honour and reputation in the contrary; that is counted noble and generous in the worlds opinion, which is odious and abominable in the sight of God: If thy Brother offend or injure thee, forgive him, saith Christ; if he proceed, forgive him; What? until seven times? I, until seventy times seven times. But how is this Doctrine received now in the world? what counsel would men, and those none of the worst sort, give thee in such a case? How would the sobereſt, discreeteſt, well-bred Christians advise thee? Why thus: If thy Brother or thy Neighbour have offered thee an injury or an affront! forgive him? By no means, of all things in the world take heed of that, thou art utterly undone in thy reputation then, if thou doest forgive him: What is to be done then? Why, let not thy heart rest, let all other business rest, let all other business and employment be laid aside, till thou hast his bloud: what, a mans bloud for an injurious passionate speech, for a disdainful look? Nay, this is not all. That thou may'st gain amongst men the reputation of a discreet well-tempered murderer, be sure thou killest him not in passion, when thy bloud is hot and boyling with the provocation; but proceed with as much temper and setledness of reason, with as much discretion and preparedness as thou wouldest to the Communion: After some several dayes meditation, invite him mildly, and affably, into some retired place, and there let it be put to the tryal, whether thy life or his must answer the injury.

39. Oh most horrible Christianity! That it should be a most sure setled way

way for a man to run into danger and disgrace with the world, if he shall dare to perform a commandement of Christ's, which is as necessarily to be observed by him, if he have any hope of attaining heaven, as meat and drink is for the sustaining of his life? That ever it should enter into the heart of a Christian to walk so exactly and curiously contrary to the wayes of God; that whereas he every day and hour, sees himself contemned and despised by thee who art his servant, his creature, upon whom he might (without any possible imputation of unrighteousness) pour down the vials of his fierce wrath and indignation; yet he, notwithstanding, is patient and long-suffering towards thee, hoping that his long suffering may lead thee to repentance, and earnestly desiring and soliciting thee by his Ministers to be reconciled unto him: Yet, that thou, for all this, for a blow in anger; it may be, for a word or less, shouldest take upon thee to send his soul, or thine, or, it may be, both, clogg'd and press'd with all your sins unrepented of (for thou canst not be so wild as to think, thou canst repent of thy sins, and yet resolve upon such a business) to expect your sentence before the judgment seat of God: wilfully and irrecoverably to deprive your selves of all those blessed means which God had contrived for your salvation, the power of his Word, the efficacy and virtue of his Sacraments; all which you shall utterly exclude your selves from, and leave your selves in such a state, that it shall not be in Gods power to do you any good. *Oh consider this all ye that fight against God, lest he tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver you.*

40. In the third place: There is another great evil under the Sun, and 3.
that is, When men are not content to dishonour Almighty God, and their glorious Religion, by unworthy scandalous Practises; but, to make themseves innocent, they will entitle God to their abominations: Of this nature are those, who are curious and inquisitive into Scripture, great students in it for this end, That they may furnish them with some places, which being violently wrested, and injuriously handled, may serve, at least in their opinion, to patronize and warrant their ungodly irreligious courses. The time will come, saith Christ to his Disciples, *when they who hate and persecute you, shall think they do God good service.* And the time is come, when men think they can give no greater, nor more approved testimony of their Religion, and zeal of God's Truth, then by hating and abhorring, by reviling and traducing their Brethren, if they differ from them in any, though the most ordinary, innocent Opinions: If men accord not altogether with them, if they run not on furiously with them in all their Tenets, they are enemies unto God and his Truth, and they can find Scripture enough to warrant them to disgrace and revile such, to raise any scandalous dishonorable reports of them, and to poyson utterly their reputation with the World.

An Application to the Communion.

I Have hitherto, as carefully as so short a time would permit (and yet, it may be, with greater earnestness then you could have been content I should) searched into the retired corners of our hearts, and there discovered a vice, which, it may be, you little expected, namely, *Atheism:* A strange vice, I confess, to be found in Christian Hearts. I have, likewise,

exemplify'd

exemplifi'd in ſome particular practices of theſe times, moſt exactly contrary to our profeſſion of Chriſtian Religion: If I ſhould endeavour to diſcover all that might be obſerved of this nature, not my hour only, but the day it ſelf would fail me. Notwithſtanding, I am reſolved to make one inſtance more about the buſineſs for which we are met together, namely, The receiving of the bleſſed body and bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: I ſuppoſe you will all acknowledge with me, that that is a buſineſs of the greateſt conſequence that a Chriſtian is capable of performing: I hope I need not to inſtruct you, how inexcuſably guilty thoſe men render themſelves who come with an unprepared heart, with an unſanctified mouth, to the partaking of theſe heavenly Myſteries: *What art thou* (ſaith God by the Pſalmiſt) *that takeſt my word into thy mouth, when thou hateſt to be reformed?* And if that be ſo great a crime for a man only to talk of God, to make mention of his Name, when the heart is unclean and unreformed; with how much greater reaſon may Chriſt ſay, What art thou that takeſt Mee into thy mouth? what art thou that dareſt devour my fleſh, and ſuck my bloud, that dareſt incorporate my fleſh and bloud into thy ſelf, to make my ſpotleſs body an inſtrument of thy luſts, a temple for the Devil to inhabite and raign in? To crucifie Chriſt once more, and put him to open ſhame? To crucifie him ſo that no good ſhall follow upon it, to make the bloud of the New Covenant a profane thing? And thus far, if not deeper, is that man guilty, that ſhall dare to come to this heavenly feaſt with ſpotted and unclean affections.

The

The Fourth Sermon.

LUK. IX. 23.

——— *Let him deny himself.*

GOod reason there is, that, according to that exceſs of value and weight, wherewith heavenly and ſpiritual things do ſurmount and preponderate earthly and tranſitory; ſo likewiſe the deſire and proſecution of them ſhould be much more contentiouſly active and earneſt, than that of the other: Yet, if men were but in any proportion ſo circumſpect, and carefull in buſineſſes that concern their eternal welfare, as even the moſt fooliſh Worldlings are about riches, honour, and ſuch trifles, as are not worthy to take up the mind even of a natural man; We ſhould not have the glorious Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, ſo careleſly and ſleepily undertaken, ſo irreſolutely and fearfully, nay, cowardly maintain'd; I might add, ſo treacherouſly pretended and betray'd to the encompaſſing of baſe and unworthy ends, as now it is.

2. To what may we more juſtly impute this negligent wretchleſs behaviour of Chriſtians, than to an extream incogitancy, and want of conſideration in us, upon what terms it is, that we have entred into league with God, and to what conſiderable ſtrict Conditions we have in our firſt initiation at our Baptiſm, ſo ſolemnly ſubmitted and engag'd our ſelves; without a ſerious reſolute performance whereof, we have promis'd by no means to expect any reward at all from God, but to remain ſtrangers, utterly excluded from the leaſt hope of enjoying any fruit of thoſe many glorious Promiſes which it hath pleaſed our gracious God, ſo liberally to offer and reach out unto us in our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.

3. It was no good ſign, when the precious ſeed of the Word was received into the ſtony ground with ſuch a ſudden Joy. Hearers reſembled by that ground, give good heed to the glorious and comfortable promiſes, which attend Religion, without having reſpect to many troubleſome and melancholick Conditions, which much neceſſarily go along too: And therefore, when perſecution begins, either within them, when they

are commanded to ſtrangle a luſt as dear unto them, and as neceſſary for their employments, as an eye, or right-hand; Or, without them, when that Profeſſion which they have undertaken becomes offenſive or ſcandalous to great men: Then, (as if they had been miſtaken in the Purchaſe, or deceiv'd by the Preacher,) the joy ſo ſuddenly kindled, aſſoon vaniſhes, and they retire themſelves home, expecting a more commodious and gainful bargain.

4. Hereupon it is, that our Saviour in this chapter ſpends two Parables, One of a King preparing for Warr, The other of a Builder for a Houſe; whereby to inſtruct his hearers, what they ſhould do before they did offer to undertake his ſervice: The ſum whereof is this; That if they had any ends and projects of their own, if they thought to ſerve themſelves upon him, they were much deceived; that they ſhould deeply, and thoughtfully conſider of what weight and conſequence the buſineſs was that they were about.

5. There is a Kingdom to be obtain'd, And a glorious Pallace, wherein are to be erected many fair Manſions to raign in: But it is a Kingdom that ſuffers violence, and the violent muſt take it by force; And it is a Building that will exact perchance all the means they have, and their whole lives labour to boot: Wherefore it is good for them to ſit down, to ſend for their friends to counſel, to queſtion their hearts, whether they have courage and reſolution, and to examin their incomes, whether they will bear the charges to muſter Souldiers for the Conqueſt, and Labourers for the Building.

6. If they like theſe large offers, and have means enough for the employment, and are not unwilling to ſpare for coſt, Let them go on in God's Name; There is no doubt to be made of an end, that ſhall fully recompence their loſſes, and ſatisfie their utmoſt boldeſt deſires, and fill the whole capacity of their thoughts. But on the other ſide, unleſs all theſe conditions concurr, He has ſo much care of their credit that he would wiſh them, not to ſet one foot further in the employment, but to betake themſelves home, leſt, if they ſhould fail in the buſineſs, they ſhould make themſelves ridiculous to the world of Scorners: to whom it would be meat and drink to ſee ſome glorious freſh ruins of a Building left to the fouls and beaſts to inhabit; or to ſee a fierce invading Army forc'd to retire themthemſelves ho me, cool'd and content with their former want and poverty.

object. 7. But might not ſome poor, low-minded, ſinful hearer reply upon our Saviour, and enquire, whence theſe ſums muſt be rais'd, and theſe forces muſtred. Alas, what is a wretched mortal man, that he ſhould think of taking Heaven by Compoſition, much more of forcing and invading it: What is there on Earth to lay in balance againſt Heaven? Has not the Spirit of God told us, that all is vanity, nay lighter then vanity, through all *Eccleſiaſtes?* And again, that men of low condition are vanity, and men of high condition (to wit, ſuch, as becauſe they abound with wealth, think that therefore they are in much better eſteem and favour with God then their Brethen) they are worſe than vanity, for as it is *Pſal. 62. 9.* Pſal. 62. 9. *They are a Lye*, that is, they are no ſuch things as they take themſelves for, they are quite contrary to what they ſeem.

8. The

8. The anſwer hereto is not very difficult: For 'tis true, If we conſider our own abilities ſuch, I mean, as our fore-fathers have left us, as it is impoſſible for us by any worth in our power, to offer at the purchaſe of heaven; as to make a new one: yet, ſuch is the mercy of God in Jeſus Chriſt, that ſo glorious a Bargain is already made to our hands, the gain whereof will redound unto us upon very reaſonable conditions; Namely, if we can be brought to acknowledg our own beggarly ſtarved eſtate, and thereby evacuating our ſelves of all manner of worth and deſert in our ſelves, and relying only upon his mercy which is infinite, ſubmitting likewiſe our ſelves to be abſolutely at his diſpoſition without any reſervation at all. *Reply.*

9. So that the ſame unvaluable precious Jewel, which coſt the rich Merchant in the Parable, all his Eſtate, and had like to have made a young Gentleman in the Goſpel turn bankrupt, may becomes ours, even the pooreſt and moſt deſpiſed perſons amongſt us; if we will be content to part with our *totum nihil*, all whatſoever we are, or have: If we can perſwade our ſelves, to eſteem pleaſure and profit as droſs and dung, when they come in competition with this Pearl? If we can readily and affectionately hate our deareſt friends and kindred, even tread our Parents under our feet, when they lye in our way unto Chriſt: If we can perfectly deteſt even the moſt deareſt cloſeſt luſts and affectionate ſins; Finally, if our own ſouls become contemptible and vile in our own eyes, in reſpect of that glorious Inheritance ſo dearly purchaſed for us: Then are we rich to purchaſe this Pearl, then are we able and ſufficient to go through with this Building, and ſtrong enough to conquer this Kingdom.

10. Now all this (as muſt be ſhowed in many more particulars) is properly to deny our ſelves, which is a condition that our Saviour makes ſo neceſſary and inſeparable in every one, that purpoſes to be any thing the better for Him, that deſires to be found in the number of thoſe that have given up their names unto him, for ſaith the Text, *Jeſus ſaid unto them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himſelf.* —— Let him ——

11. Theſe few words are not conveniently capable of a diviſion; But taking them in groſs, as a Precept or Law delivered by Chriſt, and which concerns every man, of what ſtate or condtion ſoever, that reſolves to accept of him for a Lord and Saviour: We will proceed according to the ordinary Method of expounding a Law: Namely, Firſt, we will in general, conſider the nature, meaning, and extent, of this Law; How farr the action here injoyn'd (which is a denying or renouncing) doth reach; and how much is comprehended in the object thereof, Our ſelves: Secondly, I will reſtrain this General Duty into ſeveral ſpecial Caſes, which may conveniently be reduced to three, as namely, that by vertue thereof we are bound to evacuate our ſelves, and utterly deny, 1. Our own Wiſdom or Underſtanding. 2. Our Will and Affections. And laſtly, our own Deſert and Righteouſneſs. 1. 2.

12. Out of this Commandement, then, conſidered in general terms only, (for ſo I ſhall only handle it in this hours Diſcourſe,) as it is contained in theſe two words ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, but two ſuch words, ſo full and ſwelling with expreſſion, that our language can ſcarſe at all, or but faintly, expreſs and render the force and vigour of them in twenty; I ſhall obſerve unto

Doctr. you this doctrinal position; namely, *That it is absolutely, and indispensably required of every man that professes Christianity; not only utterly to renounce all manner of things that thwart and oppose Gods will and command, but also resolutely, and without all manner of reservation, to purpose and resolve upon the denial of whatsoever is in our selves, or any thing else, how full of pleasure, profit, or necessity soever, though in themselves indifferent, lawful, or convenient; when they come in competition with what Christ hath enjoyn'd us.* Which after I have explain'd and confirm'd by comparing this law with many other precepts of the same nature in the holy Scripture, I shall apply unto your consciences by two
1. useful inforcements. *One*, taken from the extream undeniable reasonableness of the thing here commanded. *The other*, from the wonderful
2. love and kindness in the Law-giver, that requires not so much at our hands as himself hath already voluntarily perform'd, and that for our sakes: For thus, or to this purpose, run the words: *If any man will come after me, let him* do as I have done, *even deny himself, take up his*, indeed my *cross daily, and so follow me.*

13. I told you, I remember, my Text was a Law, and I repent not of the expression, though, I know not how, since our divinity has been imprison'd and fetter'd in Theses and distinctions, we have lost this word, Law; and men will by no means indure to hear, that Christ came to command us any thing, or that he requires any thing at our hands, he is all taken up in promise: All those precepts which are found in the Gospel, are nothing, in these mens opinions, but mere promises of what God will work in us, I know not how, *sine nobis*, though indeed they be delivered in fashion, like Precepts.

14. These, and many other such dangerous consequences do and must necessarily arise from that new invented Fatal Necessity; A doctrine, that fourteen Centuries of Christianity never heard of: If we will enquire after the old and good waies, we shall find the Gospel it self by its own author call'd a Law: For thus saith the Psalmist in the Person of
Psal. 2. 7. Christ: *I will preach the Law, whereof the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And how familiar are such speeches as those, in our Saviour's mouth: *This is my command; a new commandement I give unto you; Ye shall be my Disciples, if ye do those things which I command you.* Among the ancient Fathers, we find not only that Christ is a Law-giver, but that he hath published Laws which were never heard of before: That he hath enlarged the ancient precepts, and enjoyned new; and yet now 'tis Socinianism to say but half so much. *Clemens Alexandr.* (3. στρωμ. *in fine*) saith, that Christ is more than a Law-giver, he is both Λόγος καὶ Νόμος, and quotes S. *Peter* for it.

15. Well then, my Text is a Law, and a preparatory law; it is the voyce of one crying, Prepare the waies of the Lord; let all hills be depressed, and all valleys exalted. It bears indeed the same office in our conversion, or new birth, that *Aristotle* assigns to his Privation in respect of natural Generation. It hath no positive active influence upon the work, but it is *Principium Occasionale*, a condition or state necessarily supposed or prerequired in the subject before the business be accomplished. For, as in Physical Generation there can be no superinduction of forms, but the subject which expects a soul must necessarily prepare a room or mansion

ſion for it, which cannot be, unleſs the ſoul that did before inhabit there, be diſpoſſeſſed. So it likewiſe comes to paſs in our Regeneration; there is no receiving of Chriſt, to dwell and live with us, unleſs we turn all our other gueſts out of doors. The Devil, you know, would not take poſſeſſion of a houſe, till it was ſwept and garniſhed: and, Dares any man imagine, that a heart defiled, full of all uncleanneſs, a decayed ruinous ſoul, an earthly ſenſual mind, is a Tabernacle fit to entertain the Son of God? were it reaſonable to invite Chriſt to ſup in ſuch a manſion, much more to reſt and inhabit there?

16. In the ordinary ſacrifices of the old Law, God was content to ſhare part of them with his ſervants the Prieſts, and challeng'd only the inwards as his own due. And proportionably in the ſpiritual ſacrifices, his claim was, *My ſon, give me thy heart*: He was tender then in exacting all his due. It was only a temptation, we know, when God required of *Abraham*, that his only ſon *Iſaac* ſhould be offer'd *in holocauſtum*, for a whole burnt-ſacrifice, to be utterly conſum'd, ſo that no part nor relicks ſhould remain of ſo beloved a Sacrifice. Yet even in thoſe old times, there were whole burnt-offerings; whereby (beſides that one oblation of Chriſt) was prefigured likewiſe our giving up our whole ſelves, ſouls and bodies, as a living reaſonable ſacrifice unto God. And therefore our Saviour Chriſt (who came to fulfil the Law, not only by his obedience thereto, but alſo by his perfect and compleat expreſſion of its force and meaning) doth in plain terms reſolutely and peremptorily exact from all them that purpoſe to follow him, a full perfect reſignation of themſelves to his diſpoſing, without all manner of condition or reſervation.

17. This was a Doctrine never heard of in the world before compleatly delivered. Never did any Prophet or Scribe, urge or inforce ſo much upon Gods people, as is herein contained. Yet in the Evangelical Law, we have it preciſely, and accurately preſs'd; inſomuch, that the holy Spirit of God has taken up almoſt all the Metaphors that can poſſibly be imagin'd, the more forcibly to urge this ſo neceſſary a Doctrine.

18. We are commanded ſo perfectly, and wholly, to devote our ſelves to Gods ſervice; ſo earneſtly, and reſolutely, to undertake his Commands, that we muſt determine to undervalue, and deſpiſe all earthly and tranſitory things beſides; nay, from the bottom of our hearts, we muſt hate and deteſt all things (how gainful, or delightful, or neceſſary ſoever they ſeem) if they do in any meaſure hinder, or oppugn us in our journey to Chriſt.

19. We muſt not ſo much as look upon Chriſt, or glance our eyes upon his glorious mercy, expreſs'd in ſuffering and ſatisfying for us (for S. *Luke* calls this θεωρίαν) but we muſt reſolve to keep them there fix'd, and not deign to think any creature to be a ſpectacle worthy our looking on; ἀφορῶντες εἰς Ἰησοῦν, (ſaith S. *Paul*) we have no Engliſh term that can fully expreſs the force of this word; for it is not only as we have it tranſlated, *looking unto Chriſt*, but taking off our ſpeculations from other objects, and faſtning them upon Chriſt, the author and finiſher of our Faith. Heb. 12. 11.

20. When we have been once acquainted, though but imperfectly, with this ſaving knowledge, we muſt ſtrait bring our underſtandings into

captivity, unto the obedience thereof; and whatsoever other speculations we have, how delightful soever they be unto us, yet rather then they should over-leaven us, and (as Knowledge without charity is apt to do) puff us up, we must with much greater care and industry, study to forget them, and resolve with S. *Paul*, *to know nothing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.*

21. When we have had notice of that inestimable Jewel, the Kingdome of Heaven (so called by our Saviour in the Parable) exposed to sale, though our estate be never so great, our wares never so rich and glorious, yet we must resolvedly part with all we have; utterly undoe our selves, and turn bankrupts, for the purchasing of it. Hence are those commands, *Sell all thou hast.* And, lest a man should think, that when the land is sold, he may keep the money in his purse, there follows, *And give to the poor.* And such care is taken by the holy Ghost in those expressions, lest any evasions should be admitted; lest it should happen that such a Merchant should find no chapman to buy his wares, nor (which is scarce possible) hands to receive his money, when he would bestow it; it is further said, *Forsake all, leave all*: by all means quit thy self of thy own riches, run away from thy possessions. And if there be any thing yet more dear unto thee than thy possessions, as necessary as thy cloaths, *despolia teipsum, Put off the old man, with his lusts and affections*; and though he stick never so close, tear it from thee, shake off the sin that hangeth so fast on.

22. And yet the Holy Ghost proceeds further in a more forcible expression: For many Heathens have been found, that could perswade themselves to prefer fame obtain'd by a Philosophical austere life, before riches, or honours, but *every man loveth and cherisheth his flesh*: Therefore, if there be a lust so incorporated into thee, that it becomes as useful and necessary as thy right hand, or eye, yet thou must resolve to be thine own executioner, to deform, and maim thy self; for what will it profit thee, to go a proper personable man into hell. Nay, if thy whole body begin to tyrannize over thee, thou must fight and war with it, and never leave, till thou hast brought it into captivity. Then must thou use it like a slave, with short and coarse dyet, and store of correction, as S. *Paul* did, ὑποπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ. Nay more, saith he, Ἐγὼ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. Such hatred he bore to that body of sin, which did alwaies accompany him, that not content to over-master it, he did ignominiously stigmatize and brand it with the marks of slavery.

23. Yet this is not all: If it be rebellious and incorrigible, thou must even dispatch it, put it to death, and that no ordinary one, it must be a servile slavish, cruel death; *Crucifie the flesh, with the lusts and affections thereof.* A man would think that this were sufficient, and that we might here rest from further tyrannizing over our selves: but there is no such matter; *If any man hate not father, and mother, and brethren, and sisters, and all the world besides, even his own soul, for my Name sake and the Gospels, saith Christ, he cannot be my disciple.* And now we are at the heighth, never till now, did I tell you the full meaning of my Text; how far every man is ingaged by vertue of this Precept, *Let him deny himself.*

24. The

24. The ſtrength and vigour of this phraſe (which expreſſes as much indeed, as all the former laid together) we ſhall the better underſtand, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome*, if we conſider what it is to deny another: If a father, in extream diſpleaſure, do ſo caſt off his ſon, that he denies him to be his ſon, he becomes worſe than a ſtranger; for he will not ſo much as admit him to enjoy the benefit that common humanity teacheth every man to ſhew to another; he will not endure him in his ſight, leſs will he vouchſafe to expoſtulate with him; nay, he will rejoyce when he hears of ſome misfortune that hath befaln him, and be beholding to any man that will revenge his injuries upon him.

25. Thus muſt every one do, who enters into league or friendſhip with God; He muſt work himſelf out of his own acquaintance; He muſt be a ſtranger, (or, if God will have him) an enemy to all the world, and eſpecially to himſelf; though he flow with wealth, yet he muſt live as being poor, *as having nothing*, (ſaith S. *Paul.*) If affliction, or perſecution, come upon him in Gods behalf, he muſt with all joy entertain them. Whatſoever God enjoyns him, though otherwiſe never ſo diſtaſteful to him, it muſt be his meat and drink, to perform it. There is nothing muſt lay a neceſſity upon him, but only God; and, To ſerve him, he muſt account the only *Unum neceſſarium*.

26. Will you ſee an example of ſuch obedience, and that in the old Law. An extraordinary one you ſhall find in *Exod.* 32. 29. which depends upon a ſtory which went before, the ſum whereof was this: *Moſes*, in revenge of that horrible Idolatry which was committed during his abſence upon the Mount, commands the ſons of *Levi* to conſecrate every man himſelf unto the Lord, upon his ſon, and upon his brother, and upon his neighbour, by deſtroying any man, who ever he were, that came in their way: which they reſolutely performed. And this obedience of theirs, was ſo acceptable to God, that at *Moſes* death they obtain the bleſſing of Urim and Thummim above all the Tribes, with this Elogy: *He ſaid unto his father, and to his mother, I have not ſeen them, neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children, for they have obſerved thy word, and kept thy covenant.* By which obedience, the children wiped out, as it were, the fact of their father *Levi*, who had before abuſed his ſword unto injuſtice, for which he loſt the bleſſing, that elſe he ſhould have had, *Gen.* 49. Exod. 32. 29.

27. But will not here be room for that earneſt Objection, which the Diſciples, in great anxiety of mind, made to our Saviour, when he was preſſing a Doctrine of the ſame nature with this we have in hand, *Who then can be ſaved?* If there be required at our hands, ſo abſolute and peremptory a reſignation of our ſelves to Gods diſpoſal, that we muſt root out of our hearts, all manner of love of our ſelves, or any other creature, then Chriſt hath deſtroy'd the whole ſecond Table of the Law. For, at the beſt, we are but to love our neighbours as our ſelves: If therefore our firſt leſſon muſt be to learn to contemn and deſpiſe, nay, even hate our own ſouls; why do we not with the Levites, ſo commended even now, conſecrate every man himſelf to the Lord upon our kindred and neighbours, deſtroying all about us? Beſides, how dare we preſume to be rich, or retain thoſe poſſeſſions, which, as it ſeems, God hath bought from us? If our goods be not our own, if our ſouls

be

be not our own, *Men and brethren, what ſhall we do?* Into what a ſtrait are we faln? We are commanded to love our Brethren as our own ſouls, and we are commanded to hate our own ſouls, We are enjoyn'd to give God thanks for thoſe bleſſings which here we are enjoyn'd to caſt away. We are counſelled, even by our Saviour, to be perfect as our Heavenly Father is perfect, and yet we muſt deny our ſelves; Whereas the Spirit of God hath told us, That it is impoſſible that God ſhould deny Himſelf.

28. For anſwer: This Law muſt be read and underſtood, (as the Schools ſay,) *cum grano ſalis:* For, though it be moſt true, that by vertue of this Precept, We are oblig'd to an utter evacuation of the love and deſire of any thing, and of all manner of confidence in our ſelves, or any other creature: Yet this muſt be underſtood, not abſolutely, but when ſuch things come in competition with our Love or Obedience to God: For otherwiſe, we are moſt neceſſarily bound, to love our ſelves and others, to ſtudy and care for our own good, and the welfare of our Brethren, even to lay down our lives for them, So, that we are not bound to deſtroy the love of our ſelves, but only when it is a hinderance to our fulfilling of what God commands us.

29. We therefore, who have given up our Names unto Chriſt, muſt expect to enjoy the fruits of his Obedience, by treading in the ſame ſteps which he hath left unto us. As ſhall be ſhowed hereafter more plentifully.

30. And yet it is not neceſſary, that we ſhould exactly and curiouſly apply our ſelves to the Rule of his Obedience: For, whereas he voluntarily undertook the form and faſhion of a Servant, and being Lord of Heaven and Earth, deſpiſed and neglected the riches and glory of this world: We notwithſtanding are not tyed to ſuch hard conditions, but may flow and abound with wealth and honour; neither need we to deny to our ſouls any pleaſure under the Sun, but liberally enjoy it as the gift of God, as long as thereby we withdraw not our Obedience and Allegiance from God.

31. *Peccatum non eſt appetitus malarum rerum ſed diſſertio meliorum,* (ſaith St. *Auguſtine* quoted by *Lombard*, 2 *Sent.* 42. *diſt.*) *i. e.* Sin does not conſiſt in deſiring or luſting after things which in their own natures are evil and inconvenient, but in preferring a low inconſtant changeable good, before another more worthy and of greater excellency and perfection: Whileſt therefore, God has that eſtimation and value in our thoughts that he deſerves, whileſt there is nothing in our ſelves, or any other creature, which we preferr before him, whilſt we conſpire not with our luſts to depoſe him from bearing a Soveraign ſway in our hearts and Conſciences, whilſt we have no other God before Him, not committing Idolatry to Wealth, Honour, Learning, and the like. It ſhall be lawful, in the ſecond place, to love our ſelves: So that we fulfil this Commandement, when we do not Deifie our ſelves, whilſt we Sacrifice not to our own wiſdom, nor burn incenſe to the pride of our hearts, *&c.*

32. Conceive then the meaning of this Law to be ſuch, as if it had been more fully inlarg'd on this wiſe: Let every one that but hears any mention of Chriſt this day, take into deep conſideration, and ſpend his moſt ſerious morning thoughts, in pondering and weighing, whether thoſe benefits, which Chriſt hath promiſed to communicate to every one that ſhall

be

be joyned and marryed to him by a lively faith, be worthy his acceptation: Let him oppoſe to them all the pleaſures and profits which he can promiſe, or but fancy, to himſelf under the Sun.

33. If after a due comparing of theſe things together, he have ſo much wiſdom as to acknowledge, that an eternal weight of joy and glory, an everlaſting ſerenity and calmneſs be to be preferr'd before a tranſitory, unquiet, reſtleſs, unſatisfying pleaſure: And ſeeing both theſe are offered, and ſet before him; or rather ſeeing ſuch is the extream mercy of our God, that whereas the goods of this life, are not allow'd, nor ſo much as offer'd equally and univerſally to all, (For not many have ground to hope for much wealth, Not many wiſe, not many learned, ſaith St. *Paul.*) Yet to every man, whom God hath called to the acknowledgment of the Goſpel; theſe ineſtimable benefits are offered and preſented *bona fide*, without any impoſſible condition, ſo that (let the Diſputers of this Age, ſay what they will) it ſhall be found, that thoſe who have failed and come ſhort of theſe glories offered, may thank themſelves for it, and impute it to an actual voluntary miſpriſion and undervaluing of theſe riches of Gods mercies which they might have procured, and not to any fatal over-ruling power, that did inforce and neceſſitate and drive them to their deſtruction.

34. Theſe things conſidered, if you are indeed convinc'd, that light is to be preferr'd before darkneſs; It is impoſſible, but that you ſhould likewiſe acknowledg, that it were meer madneſs for a man to imagin to himſelf any the moſt vaniſhing faint expectation of thoſe glorious Promiſes, whilſt he is buſie and careful, by all means, to avoid thoſe, indeed, thorny and unpleaſant paths that lead unto them, whilſt he promiſeth to himſelf reſt and impunity, though he walk in the Imagination of his own heart; Surely the Lord will be avenged on ſuch a perſon, and will make his fierce wrath to ſmoak againſt him.

35. Therefore reſolve upon ſomething, If the Lord be God follow him, ſerve him, conform your ſelves to the form of new obedience, which he hath preſcribed: But if *Baal* be God, if Mammon be God, if your ſelves be Gods, follow the devices of your own hearts; But by no means expect any reward at all from God for diſhonouring him, or preferring a baſe unworthy luſt before his commands. Lo 'tis the Lord of Glory who is Salvation and the way too, it is he that hath profeſſed, that there is no poſſible way of attaining unto him, but by treading in the ſame ſteps which he hath left us. A way which he found full of thorns, full of difficulties, but hath left it to us, even ſtrowed with Roſes in compariſon.

36. The greateſt and moſt terrible Enemies which we can faſhion to our ſelves, are thoſe three, which St. *Paul*, hath muſtered together, and ordered them juſt Roman-wiſe, the ſtrongeſt in the Rear, 1. *Death*, and 2. the ſting of that, *Sin*; and 3. the poyſon of that ſting, *The Law*. But over all theſe, we are more then Conquerours; for it follows, *Thanks be unto God, which hath* (mark, hath already) *given us the victory through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. At the firſt, indeed, till the paths was worn, and made ſmooth, there were ſome difficulties; for, what could the Primitive Chriſtians expect, having all the world their Enemies, but reproaches, exiles, deportations, even horrible torments and death.

37. But

37. But we (blessed be our gracious God) are so farr from being annoyed with such difficulties and pressures in the way, that all those are to be feared and expected by them, that dare deny the Profession of our glorious Religion. What therefore, if the Lord had commanded some great thing of us, even as much as he did of his Beloved Servants, the Apostles, and Primitive Christians, would we not have done it? How much more, when he says only; *Be not ashamed of me*; now, when you dare not be ashamed of me; now, that it almost death to be ashamed of me: Deny not me before this generation, who would hate and persecute you to the death, if you should deny me. Crucifie unto you the unclean affections, the incendiary lusts of your hearts, which the Heathens have perform'd for the poor empty reward of fame: Preferr not riches nor honours, before me, which is no more then many Philosophers have done for those vulgar changeable Gods which themselves have contemned.

38. Having therefore (beloved Christians) such Promises to encourage us, such as the poor Heathens never dream't of, and yet, for all that, travelled more earnestly after an airy phantastical happiness of their own, then we (to our extream shame be it spoken) do after the true one: Having such advantages, even above the blessed Apostles and ancient Martyrs, Let us walk as becometh the children of God, having our eyes fastened upon the Lord our Salvation, and conforming our selves freely and unconstrainedly to whatsoever it shall please him to prescribe untous: Not admitting our own carnal reason and worldly wisdom into counsel about his Worship, nor believing any thing which he has propos'd unto us in his Word, but for the authority of him that spoke it, not accepting the persons of men, nor perswading our selves to the belief of horrible and unworthy Opinions of God, because men, affected by us, have so delivered. It was a grievous complaint, that God made by the Prophet *Isaiah*, *Cap.*29.*v.*13.

Isaiah 29. 13. *Their fear towards me is taught by the Commandements of men.*

39. Again, we must subdue our Affections to be ruled and squared according to the good Will of God, rejoycing to see our most beloved sins discover'd and rebuk'd, and even crucified by the powerful Word and Spirit of God. Lastly, We must be ready for Christ his sake, to root out of our hearts, that extravagant immoderate Love of our own selves, that private affection, as *Basil* calleth it; resolving rather to undergo a shameful horrible death, then to maintain any inordinate base desire, or to take part with our filthy lusts against our Saviour, who hath so dearly redeem'd us.

40. Thus have you heard in General tearms largely, and, I fear, tediously, delivered the sum and effect of this Doctrin of Self-Denyal, (for the restraining of it to particular Cases, I have reserved to another hour): Now I will, according to my promise, as earnestly as I can, inforce this necessary duty upon you, from the two Circumstances before-mentioned, *viz.* 1. From the greater reasonableness in the thing commanded; And 2. Extream Love and Kindness of the Law-giver, that hath in his own person, given us a perfect example directing us how we should fulfill his command.

41. For the first, namely, the reasonableness of the thing commanded: To omit, how all creatures, in acknowledgment of that duty which they owe to God their Creator, do willingly submit themselves to his disposition,

deny-

denying their own ſpecifical private natures for the general good of the world. For example; The Elements are ſubject to alterations and deportations, to be deſtroy'd and revived, to be Inſtruments of Gods favour, and again, of his wrath: Surely, Man above all the World beſide, (not excepting that glorious heavenly Hoſt of Angels,) is by a more indiſſolable Adamantine chain oblig'd and bound to his Maker; *For, to which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?*

42. Again, when a great portion of thoſe glorious Spirits had mutinouſly rebelled againſt God, and Man following the example of their prevarication, had with them plung'd himſelf irrecoverably into extream unavoidable deſtruction; In that neceſſity, God had no reſpect to thoſe heavenly Spirits, which were by nature much more admirable and perfect then we; for he did in no wiſe (ſaith the Apoſtle) take upon him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the ſeed of *Abraham*, and therein performed the glorious work of our Redemption.

43. Surely, after this great Love, than which (I dare not ſay, God cannot, but) I may well ſay, he will never ſhow a greater, we, his unworthy creatures, are bound to expreſs ſome greater meaſure of thankful obedience then we were for our Creation. And, yet even then, the leaſt that could be expected from us, was a full perfect reſignation of our ſelves, to the diſpoſition of that God that gave us our being. Therefore now, after a work that has coſt God all that pains and ſtudy in inventing and contriving, and ſo much ſorrow and labour in performing; Certainly, after all this, it is no great thing, if the Lord ſhould require our whole ſelves, ſouls and bodies, for a whole burnt-offering a Sacrifice of praiſe and thanksgiving: If he ſhould require from us our whole ſubſtance, whole Rivers of Oyl, and all the Cattel feeding on a Thouſand Hills.

44. Yet now he is content, that leſs thanks ſhall ſatisfie, then was due before ever he perform'd that glorious work: Nay, he hath after all this taken off and ſubducted from that debt which we ow'd him for our Creation. For whereas then one actual offence againſt this Law, did neceſſarily draw along with it inevitable deſtruction; yet now, our gracious God perceiving that we are but duſt, accepts of our imperfect ſinful obedience; nay ſometimes of the inward deſire and willingneſs to perform, where there is not power to put it in execution. Nothing then can be more reaſonable, then that a Chriſtian ſhould be commanded, not to prefer the fulfilling of his own will before Gods Will nor to ſuffer that his carnal deſires, ſhould have greater power and ſway with him, then the command of ſuch a God; or, Laſtly, not to withdraw his Allegiance and Obedience due to his Redeemer, and place them upon a creature, but equal, or may be, inferiour to himſelf.

45. Secondly, Conſider the wonderful love and kindneſs of the Lawgiver, that hath already taſted unto us; taſted, nay, hath drunk the dregs of this unpleaſant bitter potion. He by whom all things were made, even the Eternal Almighty Word: He which thought it no robbery to be equal with God, became his own creature, and ſubmitted himſelf to be trod upon, reviled, hated, deſpiſed by the worſt of all creatures, cruel, ungodly, and perverſe ſinners: He of whoſe fulneſs we have all received, did utterly evacuate and empty himſelf of his Glory and Majeſty, denying to himſelf ſuch things,

which

which he would not, even to the moſt deſpiſed creatures. For, ſaith he, *The Foxes have holes, and the Birds of the air have neſts, but the Son of Man*
2 Cor. 8. 9. *hath not whereon to lay his head. Ye know* (ſaith St. *Paul*, 2 Cor. 8. 9.) *the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that though he was rich, he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich.* So poor he was, that he was forced to borrow Tribute money of a Fiſh, and was fain to ſtrain himſelf to a Miracle to get the Fiſh to bring it. So poor, that he was forc'd to borrow a young Colt of ſtrangers, never known to him; *Say*, (ſaith he) *The Lord hath need of him.* A ſtrange unheard of ſpeech! The Lord that created the world, and can as eaſily annihilate it, Yet he hath need, and hath need of a Colt, the Foal of an Aſs. Time would fail me, for I ſuppoſe the World it ſelf would not contain the Books that might be written of his dangers, his temptations, his faſtings, his travels, his diſgraces, torments, and death; all perform'd, without any end propos'd to himſelf beſides our good and happineſs.

Heb. 2. 17, 18. 46. *It behoved him* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *to be made like his Brethren in all things, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Prieſt in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the ſins of the People; For in that he himſelf hath ſuffred being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them which are tempted.* Which of you (my Beloved friends), when he does ſeriouſly meditate on this place, will not be forc'd to ſit down, even raviſh'd and aſtoniſh'd at the exceſſive & ſuperabundant Mercy of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: That he which was the God that created us, in whom we live, move, and have our being; and, being more intrinſecal to us then our own Natures (as the Schools do boldly expreſs) doth know our moſt hidden thoughts, long before they are, that he, notwithſtanding, ſhould deſcend to ſubmit himſelf to the ſame infirmities and temptations with us, to this end, that by bettering and adding to that knowledg which he had before of our wants and miſeries, to wit, by perfecting and increaſing his former ſpeculative knowledg by a new acquired experimental knowledg, he might be better acquainted with what we want, and thereby more inclin'd to Mercy and Commiſeration, and more powerful to ſuccour us being tempted.

47. See, Behold (beloved Chriſtians) how for our ſakes, he hath enlarg'd, as it were, three of his glorious incomprehenſible Attributes, 1. His Omniſcience, by knowing that perſonally and experimentally, which he did before only know contemplatively. 2. His Mercy, in that this his Knowledg, doth more incite his Goodneſs. And 3. his Omnipotent Power, for (ſaith the Text) in that he himſelf hath ſuffered, being tempted, he is (thereby) able to ſuccour them which are tempted. There ſeems likewiſe to be an acceſs to his Glory by this his great Humility; For ſaith the Text in *Heb.* 5. 5.
Heb. 5. 5. *Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be an High Prieſt.*

48. Wo unto us, my beloved friends, if ſuch mercies as theſe be neglected and ſleightned by us: Wo unto us, if a Commandement proceeding from ſuch a Law-giver have not greater force upon us, then any Obligation whatſoever.

Uſe 1. 49. And if theſe things be ſo, then (in the firſt place), How miſerably are thoſe deceived, that think they have ſufficiently obſerv'd this Commandement when they deny to themſelves ſome one delightful inſinuating affection, ſome one enormous crying ſin, to which they ſee others wilfully and

and ſcandalouſly devoted; yet in the mean time, reſerve to themſelves many a boſome, private, beloved luſt.

50. You that know the ſtory of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, may remember with what a fearful name the Holy Spirit hath branded their ſin; it is called no leſs then Lying to the Holy Ghoſt: it comes near both in name and condition to that fearful ſin for which Chriſt did not dye, and for which God could yet never find mercy enough to forgive.

51. Yet, conſider what this ſin was: They voluntarily ſold all the means they had, that the money, being equally divided, might ſupply the neceſsity of thoſe that wanted. Notwithſtanding, to make ſure work for ſome certain eſtate whereupon they might relie, they ſubducted ſome part of the money, and laid the reſt at the Apoſtles feet.

52. S. *Peter* told them, that their land was in their own power; neither did any conſtraint lye upon them, to enforce them to ſell all: But ſince they had profeſs'd themſelves among the number of them, which were willing to cloathe, and cheriſh, and feed Chriſt, in the perſons of their new-converted brethren: It was horrible theft, and deſperate lying againſt God, to diminiſh one penny of the ſum.

53. Now, that you may know how much this concerns you: Which of you (Be'oved Chriſtians) hath not ſolemnly, and publickly, ſworn and vowed to Almighty God at your Baptiſm, not to prefer the vain pomp and vanities of this world, much leſs, the abominable crimes thereof, above your Saviour, into whoſe name you were baptized?

54. Are not you then moſt ſhamefully perjur'd, when you are ſo far from renouncing the vanities of this world for Chriſt his ſake, that you will not be withdrawn from the crimes of it? When the baſe luſt of an Harlot, or the furious exceſs of Wine, or that untempting, undelightful, and therefore more unpardonable ſin of Swearing, and Blaſphemy, ſhall be of ſufficient force with you every hour, not only to withdraw all manner of reſpect, and obedience from Chriſt, but even to make you crucifie him again, and to put him to open ſhame.

55. And do not pleaſe your ſelves in this conceit, that becauſe God does not exact of you now the forfeiture of your vow and promiſe, as he did of *Ananias* and his Wife, that therefore your caſe is much better than theirs: For, let me tell you, as our Saviour on ſuch an occaſion told the Jews: *Think you that you are leſs ſinners than they whoſe bloud* Pilate *mingled with the ſacrifices, or thoſe upon whom the Tower of Siloe fell?* So let me ſay unto you: Think you, that becauſe God ſhewed ſo terrible an example upon *Ananias* and *Saphira*, for their lying to the Holy Ghoſt, by taking them away ſuddenly, by a fearful death; and hath not yet ſhewed the like upon you, that your ſin comes much ſhort of theirs, and that you may notwithſtanding eſcape? *I tell you nay, but except ye repent, ye ſhall likewiſe periſh.* Alas, what a trifle was that judgement which befell them, to thoſe plagues which are reſerved for wilful obſtinate ſinners?

56. I beſeech you therefore, Brethren, even by the bowels of Jeſus Chriſt, that you would conſider what it is you do, when you allow your ſelves in the practiſe of any one habitual ſin; it is no leſs then a wilful wiping off the water wherewith you were Baptized; it is no leſs than an abjuring of Chriſt: nay, it is no leſs than a devoting and ſacrificing your ſelves to Devils.

Uſe 2. 57. In the ſecond place, Where will thoſe appear, that are ſo far from denying all for Chriſt, that, for his ſake, they will not leave one delightful profitable ſin; they will rather deny Chriſt himſelf, than the leaſt troubleſome pleaſure, running into all exceſs of riot: nay, they will ſell Chriſt cheaper than *Judas* did; they will ſell him, and take no money for him. What elſe do thoſe that ſpend their time in idle vain Lying, in fruitleſs Oaths, in unneceſſary Blaſphemy? They can be content to ſee Chriſt himſelf almoſt every day naked, and do not cloathe him; hungry, and do not feed him; in priſon, and do not viſit him; for in as much as they perform not theſe works of charity to his beloved little ones, they deny them to Him. Will they be found worthy of Chriſt, that for his ſake will not do ſo much as a Heathen hath done in an humour, or for the unprofitable reward of fame? that, for his ſake, will not forgive their brother ſome ſmall injury received; nay, perhaps ſome great kindneſs offered, as a ſeaſonable correction, or loving diſſwaſion from ſin; that, for his ſake, will not take the leaſt pains in furthering their own ſalvation?

Uſe 3. 58. Laſtly, What will become of me, and you, (beloved Fathers and brethren of the Clergy)? We to whom God hath entruſted the exerciſe and managing of three or four of his glorious Attributes: for to us is committed the Goſpel of Chriſt, which is the Wiſdom of God hidden from the world. And to us is committed the Goſpel of Chriſt, which is the Power of God to ſalvation, and which worketh mightily in them which believe, even according to the mighty working whereby he raiſed Chriſt from the dead. And to us is committed the Goſpel of Chriſt, even the Diſpenſation of the riches of his glorious Mercy, and compaſſions.

59. What then will become of us, if we, notwithſtanding theſe great ingagements, theſe ineſtimable prerogatives, ſhall turn this Wiſdom of God into fooliſhneſs, by exalting, and deifying our own carnal wiſdom; if we ſhall weaken and make void this Almighty Power, by the violent oppoſition of our ſinful luſts and affections; finally, if we ſhall be too ſparing and niggardly in the Diſpenſing of theſe his Mercies; if we ſhall render his goodneſs ſuſpected to our hearers, as if thoſe frequent and plentiful Offers of pity and compaſſion, were only empty hiſtrionical expreſſions, and not profeſſions of a mind, heartily and ſincerely inclined unto us.

60. I will tell you what will become of us; and I ſhall the better do it, by telling you firſt, what an exceſſive weight of Glory, we eſpecially, ſhall loſe by it: *They that be wiſe* (ſaith *Daniel*) *ſhall ſhine as the brightneſs of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteouſneſs, as the ſtars for ever and ever.* Not as thoſe vulgar ordinary ſtars, that have light enough only to make them viſible; but like thoſe more noble lights, which are able to caſt a ſhadow through the whole Creation, even like the Sun in his full ſtrength. And the preferment we are likely to gain, is very anſwerable to our loſs, we ſhall be glorious ſhining fire-brands, of the firſt magnitude, in whoſe fearful horrible deſtruction, God will ſhew what he is able to do.

The

The Fifth Sermon.

ROM. VIII. 34.

Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, Yea rather that is risen again.——

IF I durst appear in this place with any ends and projects of mine own; If whilest I preach unto you Jesus Christ, I could think it worth my labour to lose a thought about the purchasing of a vain, fruitless reputation, and opinion amongst my hearers; surely, I should by no means omit so commodious and tempting an opportunity, as this argument of Christs Resurrection may suggest unto me. It being a business, in the effecting whereof, above all the works which God ever made since he began to work, he most especially glorified almost all his divine Attributes: It being a deliverance, even of God himself, from destruction and rottenness.

2. It is an argument so pleasing to *S. Paul*, that in many places, he seems to magnifie it even to the undervaluing, and disparagement of whatsoever Christ before either did or suffered. In a Sermon of his (*Act.* 13.) preached at *Antioch*, he makes it the complement and fulfilling of whatsoever God before had promised to the Fathers, and of all the Prophecies which, since the beginning of the world, had been delivered by Gods Messengers. To make which good, the Apostle himself in that place (whereas he needed not to strain so far; there were then extant Prophecies enow purposely and precisely decaring the glory and power of Christs Resurrection) he notwithstanding, as it would seem, mistakes that famous Prophecy of Christs Birth in those words of the 2d Psalm: *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*; and seemingly misapplies them to his Resurrection. Why, was he then indeed the Carpenter's son? was it a confession, and not humility, that he call'd himself the son of man? Were the torments of his passion and death (as himself seems to intimate, *Joh.* 16. 21.) only the pangs and throws of his new birth?

Act. 13.

Psal. 2.

3. By no means: He was even in the extreameſt degree, and loweſt point of his humiliation: yea, when himſelf in that laſt terrible Agony, did ſeem to call it in queſtion; yet then alſo he was indeed the only begotten eternal Son of God: Or, if he had not, moſt miſerable and deſperate had been our caſe. But by his Reſurrection, he did declare, unqueſtionably, and without all contradiction, unto the world, his Glory and Majeſty: Or, to ſpeak in S. *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* 1. *He was mightily declared to be the Son of God, by his Reſurrection from the dead.*

4. But we now celebrate a Feaſt, a ſeaſon of Joy and exultation, which we uſe not to do upon the memory of Gods moſt wonderful acts and exploits, though never ſo much expreſſing the glory of his Majeſty and Power; unleſs they have been beneficial unto us, unleſs they have very nearly concern'd our ſafety and happineſs.

5. And ſurely this great deliverance of Chriſt from the dominion and power of Hell and the Grave; when God called his Son the third time out of *Egypt*: this victory of his, did in a high degree import us, and advance our welfare; it had ſome more then ordinary influence upon our ſalvation; otherwiſe, this ſeaſon dedicated to the memory thereof, would not have been ſo acceptable to the primitive Chriſtians, to make them (as it were in revenge and faction againſt the late melancholy time of Faſting and repentance) for its ſake, to ſet up an Anti-Lent, and to appoint other forty daies of Feaſting and triumph, which was more (as *Tertullian* boaſteth) then all the ſolemn Holy-daies of the Heathen joyned together. Yea, ſo ſcrupulous were they in the celebration of this Feaſt, (quite oppoſite to the ſolemn peeviſhneſs of ſome Chriſtians of our times) that for the whole ſpace between Eaſter and Pentecoſt, as it is thought, they quite intermitted the works and exerciſe of their vocations: they would not ſuffer one Faſting-day to appear; they left off their ſeverity and diſcipline, their *Vigilia*, and *Stationes*; Nay, they would not, all that time, ſo much as *De geniculis adorare* (in the witty barbarous expreſſion of the ſame Father, in his Book *De Corona Militis*) they would not ſhew ſo much faint-heartedneſs and dejection, as to kneel at prayers.

6. Therefore, in ſtead of ſaying fine things of the faſhion and contrivance of this buſineſs of Chriſt's Reſurrection; in ſtead of raiſing matter of wonder and aſtoniſhment out of the glory and power of it; I will endeavour (being to conclude the ſolemn celebration of this Feaſt) by way of Uſe and Application, to diſcover the iſſue and fruit thereof in reſpect of us; not only the convenience, but the extream neceſſity, and the ſtrict cohærence, which our Salvation has, not only upon the Satisfaction and death, but upon the Reſurrection and life of our bleſſed Saviour.

7. Now we find many things aſcribed to Chriſts Life and Death in Holy Scripture, only as to Patterns and exemplary cauſes, being Duties which the conſideration of Chriſts Death and Reſurrection, ought proportionably to exact from us: As, If Chriſt be dead, Then count your ſelves alſo dead unto Sin; If riſen again, then count your ſelves alive unto Righteouſneſs. For how it ſhould come to paſs, that ſo much of our Holineſs as makes up mortification and no more, ſhould be aſcribed to Chriſts Death, as a proper effect and fruit thereof; And the reſt, which

is

is newneſs of life and obedience, ſhould be imputed to his Reſurrection, I ſhall never be able to comprehend.

8. The benefits therefore which accrew unto us by Chriſt, I ſuppoſe may be divided either into thoſe which flow from the merit of his Death, or from the power and influence of his Life. In the former, are comprehended all whatſoever Chriſt hath done for us; In the latter, whatſoever he doth or will work in us. And both being extremely neceſſary, It ſhall be this hours employment, to ſhew with what good reaſon we celebrate a feaſt at this time, that we ſhould not terminate our contemplation only on the great love and bowels of compaſſions on Good-Friday expreſſed unto us; but alſo, and with better reaſon, on the Joy and comfort, which with great reaſon we may collect from this buſineſs of Eaſter; even that lively hope whereunto we are regenerated by the Reſurrection of Chriſt: And to joyn with S. *Paul* in his wonder and amazement, at the conſideration of the infinite mercy and power of God; and thereupon his boaſting and challenging, ſecurely, all manner of adverſaries: *Who is he that ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that juſtifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that died, yea rather, that is riſen again.*

9. In which words are comprehended the great dependance and combination, which our non-condemnation or ſalvation has; not only with the death and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, but alſo rather, even with advantage on his Reſurrection. Now, becauſe they are ſo few, they cannot conveniently be divided, I will out of them raiſe this Doctrinal Propoſition, namely, *That Chriſts Reſurrection and exaltation, is fully as neceſſary and effectual to procure and perfect our ſalvation, if not more, then even the all-ſufficient Sacrifice upon the Croſs.* *Doctr.*

10. Which, that I may more fully and diſtinctly confirm unto you, I will divide into two Propoſitions, which if ſufficiently maintain'd, doth neceſſarily infer the Doctrine. The firſt whereof is this: *That the purpoſe of Chriſt, who ſatisfied for our ſins, and the Covenant which he made with God, who accepted of this ſatisfaction, was not, that remiſſion of ſins ſhould immediately enſue upon his death, but only upon performance of the Conditions of the new Covenant made in Chriſts Bloud; which are, unfeigned Repentance for Sin, and a ſerious Converſion unto God by Faith.* *Prop.* 1. The Second: *That by the Dominion and Power of Chriſt, which at his Reſurrection, and not before, he received, as a reward of his great humility; we are not only enabled to the performance of the conditions of this new Covenant, and, by conſequence, made capable of an Actual application of his ſatisfaction; but alſo, by the ſame power, we ſhall hereafter be raiſed up, and exalted to everlaſting Happineſs.* *Prop.* 2. Of theſe two Propoſitions therefore in the order propoſed, very briefly, and even too too plainly. And firſt of the firſt, namely, *That the purpoſe of Chriſt, who,* &c. *Prop.* I.

11. I confeſs, it would be no hard matter for a Diſputant, meeting with an adverſary that would be content to be ſwayed and governed by Reaſon alone; to moleſt, and even fright him from the truth of this Doctrine. For, if we ſhall conſider not only the exceſſive unſpeakable Torments which Chriſt ſuffered for us, but eſpecially the infinite Majeſty and Glory of the Perſon, who willingly ſubmitted himſelf to that Curſe: what leſs reward can be expected, than the preſent deliverance

and ſalvation, not only of a few ſelected men, but even of many worlds of Men and Angels.

12. But it is not for us, Beloved Chriſtians, to ſet our price and value upon Chriſts precious Bloud, to ſay, Thus much it is worth, and no more. As there have not wanted men on the other ſide, who have dared to affirm, That Chriſts Bloud, according to exact eſtimation, did amount to a certain value, by the worth and coſt whereof, ſuch a ſet number as ſhall be ſaved, were redeem'd and purchas'd. And if one beſides ſhould be delivered, it were more than the price of the Bloud came to. What a fearful dangerous curioſity is this? Is it not a piece of *Judas* his ſin, to ſet our own eſtimation and value, to make a bargain, and ſale of Chriſts Death; to ſet up a kind of ſhambles to ſell his Fleſh and Bloud in?

13. But leaving theſe vain phantaſtical Calculations to their chief Profeſſours, the Schoolmen, who are ſo unreaſonably addicted to this dreaming Learning, that nothing can eſcape their Compaſs and Ballance. For, to omit their curious deſcriptions and Maps of the dimenſions, and ſituation of Heaven and Hell; the Figure, Borders, Iſlands of both; They have undertaken to diſcover the exact proportionable increaſe of the graces of the Saints, eſpecially of the Bleſſed Virgin; whoſe good actions they have found to encreaſe juſt *in Octupla ratione*: ſo that, for example, her twentieth good action, did exceed the firſt in virtue and intention of Grace, as much as the whole earth doth exceed a grain of muſtard-ſeed.

14. Is not this (Beloved Friends) a learning and wiſdom to be pitied? Is not this that diſeaſe which S. *Paul* diſcovers (1 *Tim.* 6.) the effect whereof, is to make men ſick about vain queſtions, and oppoſitions of ſcience, falſly ſo called? Therefore leaving theſe vain Speculations, as likewiſe others about the buſineſs in hand, no leſs curious, and much more dangerous, yet ſecurely ſtated in theſe daies, almoſt in every Pamphlet and Synopſis. As namely, Whether God could have contrived any courſe for mans ſalvation, beſide that which he proſecuted? Whether, without accepting any ſatisfaction to his Juſtice, he could freely and abſolutely have remitted our ſins?

15. For, what uſe or profit can be made of theſe Queſtions, though with never ſo great ſubtilty and curioſity ſtated? Beſides, we find that God had profeſſed unto *Adam*, that his death, together with the deſtruction of all mankind, ſhould be the reward of the breach of his Covenant. By which means Gods Juſtice being intereſted in the buſineſs, the very grounds and foundation of this latter queſtion are deſtroyed, the doubt and ſcrue whereof muſt needs have been blaſphemous: namely, Whether God could have been unjuſt? Nay more, it makes the ſending of Chriſt into the world, together with his obedience to the death, even that accurſed death of the Croſs, to be a matter of no neceſſary importance; to be only a great Complement, whereby God ſhews unto mankind, that, though he could eaſily have remitted their ſins without any ſatisfaction (for whatſoever is poſſible to God is eaſie) notwithſtanding, that they ſhould ſee, He would ſtrain himſelf even farther for them, was very requiſite; and withall, to ſhew his abomination of ſin, he was content, that all this adoe, all theſe pompous Tragical buſineſſes ſhould be performed.

16. But

16. But what ſaith the Scripture? If there had been a Law which could have given life, Chriſt ſhould have died without cauſe. And thereupon our Apoſtle (in *Rom.* 3. 25.) ſaith, that *God hath ſet forth his Son to be a propitiation through faith in his Bloud, to declare his righteouſneſs for the remiſsion of ſins, that are paſt through the forbearance of God. To declare, I ſay, at this time his righteouſneſs, that he might be Juſt* —— Rom. 3. 25.
That is, leſt by the forbearance of God, who ſince the foundation of the world had ſhewed no ſufficient example of his hatred and indignation unto ſin; as alſo to ſhew there was a reaſon ſufficient to move him to remit the ſins of many his choſen ſervants before Chriſt: He hath now at laſt evidently expreſſed unto the world his righteouſneſs; to wit, his ἔνδειξιν, and ἀνταπόδοσιν, by condemning ſin, and revenging himſelf upon it, in the perſon of his beloved innocent Son.

17. And leſt all this ſtir ſhould ſeem to have been kept only to give us ſatisfaction, and to create in us a great opinion and conceit of his righteouſneſs; The Apoſtle clearly ſaith, He did all this to *declare at this time his righteouſneſs, that he might be Juſt.* Which otherwiſe it ſeems he could not have been. But I am reſolved to quit my ſelf abruptly, and even ſullenly, of thoſe queſtions, and betake my ſelf more cloſely to the matter in hand.

18. What therefore is the effect and fruit which accrews even to the elect of God, by virtue of Chriſts ſatisfaction, humiliation, and death, preciſely conſidered, and excluding the power and virtue of his Reſurrection and glorious life? Why, Reconciliation to God, Juſtification or remiſſion of ſins, and finally, Salvation both of body and ſoul. But is there any remiſſion of ſins without Faith? Shall we not only exclude Works from Juſtification, but Faith alſo? God forbid. For ſo we ſhould not only contradict the grounds of Gods holy Word, but alſo raſe and deſtroy the very foundations of the ſecond Covenant.

19. For anſwer; We muſt conſider our Reconciliation under a twofold ſtate (according to the Diſtinction of the Reverend and learned Dr *Davenant* Biſhop of *Salisbury*) 1. Either as it is *Applicabilis*, not yet actually conferr'd: Or, 2. as *Applicata*, particularly ſealed and confirm'd to us by a lively Faith. For the underſtanding of which, we muſt know, that in Chriſts death, there was not only an aboliſhing of the old Covenant of Works; the Hand-Writing which was againſt us, *which Chriſt nailed unto his Croſs* (as S. *Paul* ſaith, *Col.* 1.) delivering us from the curſe and obligation thereof: But alſo, there was a new gracious Covenant, or (which is a word expreſſing greater comfort to us) a new Will or Teſtament made, wherein Chriſt hath bequeathed unto us many glorious Legacies, which we ſhall undoubtedly receive, when we ſhall have performed the Conditions, when we ſhall be found qualified ſo as he requires of us.

20. Till which Conditions be performed by the power of Gods Spirit aſſiſting us; all that we obtain by the death of Chriſt is this: That, firſt, whereas God, by reaſon of ſin, was implacably angry with us, would by no means accept of any reconciliation with us, would hearken to no conditions: Now by virtue of Chriſts death and ſatisfaction, he is graciouſly pleaſed to admit of Compoſition; the former averſation, and inexorableneſs is taken away; or, to ſpeak more ſignificantly 1.

2. ficantly in S. *Paul*'s language (*Eph.* 2. 16.) *Enmity is ſlain.* Secondly, that whereas before we were liable to be tried before the throne of his exact ſevere rigorous Juſtice, and bound to the performance of Conditions, by reaſon of our own contracted weakneſs become intolerable, nay impoſsible, unto us: we are releaſed of that obligation, and though not utterly free'd from all manner of conditions, yet tyed to ſuch as are not only poſsible, but, by the help of his Spirit which inwardly diſpoſeth and co-operateth with us, with eaſe and pleaſure to be performed. Beſides which, we have a throne of Equity and Grace to appear before. Mercy is exalted above, even againſt Juſtice; it rejoyceth againſt Judgement; it is become the higher Court, and hath the priviledges of a Superiour Court, that Appeals may be made from the Inferiour Court of
3. Juſtice, to that of Mercy and favour. Nay more, whereas before we were juſtly delivered into the power of Satan, now being reconciled to God by the Bloud of Chriſt, we are (as it is in *Col.* 1. 13.) delivered from the power of darkneſs, and tranſlated into the Kingdom of his dear Son.

21 All this, and more (if it were the buſineſs of this time to be punctual in diſcovering all) hath Chriſt wrought for us, being aliens and ſtrangers, yea enemies, afar off, without God in the world. Yet for all this, that Chriſt hath merited thus much for us, and more; notwithſtanding, take away the power of Chriſts Reſurrection, and Life; take away the influence of his Holy Spirit, whereby we are regenerated and made new Creatures; and we are yet in the Gall of bitterneſs, and Bond of iniquity. For though (as it is *Heb.* 10. 19.) we have παῤῥησίαν, *i. liberty*, and free leave, to enter into the Holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus, though there be a way made open; yet walk we cannot, we are not able to ſet forwards into it, as long as we are bound and fettered with our ſins: though there be an acceſs to the throne of Grace, yet it is only for them which are ſanctified.

22. And therefore what dangerous conſequences do attend that Doctrine which teacheth, That immediately upon the death of Chriſt, all our ſins are actually forgiven us, and we effectually reconciled. But becauſe another employment is required by this time, I will, out of many, make uſe of two Reaſons only to deſtroy that Doctrine; whereof the one is taken from the nature of the ſecond Covenant: the other, from the neceſſity of Chriſts Reſurrection.

23. For the firſt: If we, that is, the Elect of God (for I am reſolved to have to do with none elſe at this time) be effectually reconciled to God, by vertue of Chriſts death, having obtain'd a full perfect remiſſion of all our ſins, why are we frighted; or to ſay truly, injured with new Covenants? why are we, ſeeing our Debts are paid to the utmoſt farthing, the Creditor's demands exactly ſatisfied, the Obligation cancell'd; why then are we made believe that we are not quite out of danger; nay, that unleſs we our ſelves out of our own ſtock pay ſome charges and duties extraordinarily, and by the Bye inforced upon us, All the former payments, how valuable ſoever, ſhall become fruitleſs, and we to remain accomptable for the whole debt?

24. But it may be (and that ſeems moſt likely) there is no ſuch thing indeed as a new Covenant: Promiſes, and Threatnings, are only a prety kind

kind of Rhetorical device, which God is pleased to use, sometimes to allure us, and win our hearts to do that which shall please him; other times to startle, and affright us, when we are about something contrary to his command. And to say the truth, This must of necessity be the issue of the former Doctrin: For how is it possible to make these things hold together; We are already perfectly reconciled to God by the death of his Son, without any consideration had to our personal Faith and Repentance; And yet, unless we do earnestly repent us of our sins, and with a lively Faith adhere to God's Promises, we shall never be reconciled unto God! Or these, All our sins are already remitted, and that only for the vertue of Christ's satisfaction: And yet unless we believe, our sins shall never be forgiven us!

25. So that by this reckoning, we must be forced to purge the Gospel of those troublesome dangerous terms of Covenants, and Conditions, of those fruitless affrighting Conjunctions, *Si Credideris, Si non pœnitentiam egeris.* Or (which is all one) soften them into a sense utterly repugnant and warring against the natural force and signification of the words; on this wise: Where the Scripture saith, If thou repentest not, thy sins shall not be forgiven thee; Thou art not to conceive, that forgiveness of thy sins is a work yet to be done, or that it has any dependance upon any thing in thee: But this great blessing shall be hid from thine eyes, thou shalt never come to the knowledg of it, and thereby shalt live here a discontented pensive, suspicious life: Again, If thou believest, thou shalt be saved, that is, Thou shalt obtain a comfortable assurance of Hope, nay, an infallible faith of thy future Salvation: though that was intended thee, without any consideration of thy faith.

26. So that the Gospel of Christ, is not the power of God unto Salvation: for, How can the Word be an Instrument of that, which was long ago absolutely perform'd and purchased? And therefore Christ his preaching, his miracles, and tears, The Apostles travels and persecutions, The sending of the Holy Spirit, Baptism, Eucharist, Imposition of hands, Absolution, and many more blessed means of our Salvation, were not instituted for this end, to make us capable of Remission of our Sins (for that (it seems) was already not only meritoriously, but effectually procured, and without all manner of Conditions infallibly destin'd to Gods Elect); but only for this end, That whilst they live here, to their thinking, in danger and hazard, (but they are Fools for thinking so) they may now and then be a little cheared and comforted with apprehending what Christ hath done for them, and to what a comfortable state and Inheritance he hath destin'd them. Thus the Covenant which God hath sworn shall be everlasting, is by the improvidence and ignorance of some men rendred unprofitable, yea utterly abrogated: But (*Ne quid inclementius dicam*) we have not so learned Christ.

27. The second Reason destroying the former Doctrin, I told you should be taken from the necessity of Christ's Resurrection. For, if the immediate effect of Christs Death, be the purchasing of a perfect reconciliation with God, and full remission of Sins for us the Elect of God; Then (I will not say, what Benefit), but, What necessity is there of Christ's Resurrection in respect of us? For by this accompt, after the *Consummatum est*, upon the Cross, when the satisfaction was perfected, and our debts pay'd:

Though

Though Christ had afterwards miscarryed, though he had been detain'd by death, though his Soul had been left in Hell, and he had seen corruption; Notwithstanding we should stand upon good terms with God, unless we shall conceive of Him worse then of the most oppressing Usurer, that when a debt is dischar'gd, and the Bond cancell'd, will notwithstanding not release the Prisoner, unless the undertaker come in Person, or by main force deliver him.

28. I confess, that to see a friend that had ventur'd so farr for us, as our Saviour did, that to do us good had put himself in such extream danger. I say, to see such a one to be utterly cast away, without all hopes and possibility of being able to pay him our thanks, would be a spectacle, which would grieve and pierce our very souls, it would be a renting to our bowels. But this is only Charity and Gratitude, or good nature in us, which would procure this grief; not that it stands upon our safety, his preservation being a matter only of convenience, not extream necessity to us.

29. We all do worthily condemn and detest, that blasphemous Heresie of the Socinians, who exclude the meritorious death and sufferings of Christ, from having any necessary influence into our Justification, or Salvation, making it of no greater vertue then the sufferings of the blessed Martyrs, who by their death, set their Seal and Testimony to the Truth of the Gospel, which freely offers forgiveness of sins to all penitent believers. Now the same injury which these Hereticks do to the merit of Christ's death, In proportion the former doctrin fastens upon his Resurrection, and new life, by taking from it the chief and proper effect thereof, which is an actual vindication of us from the power of sin, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, by the power of Christs Spirit plentifully by him diffused and shed abroad in our hearts, and making the chief vertue thereof to consist in affording us only matter of comfort and hope, that God will deal no otherwise with us, then he hath dealt with Christ, and after a life full of disturbance and misery, revive us to glory and immortality with his Son for evermore: whereas St. *Paul* hath another kind of conceit of Christs Resurrection: for, saith he, in *Heb.* 5. 9. Christ being made perfect, (*i. e.* glorified, *c.* 2. 10.) becomes Author of eternal Salvation to all that obey him: *And if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, you are yet in your sins*; and *if Christ be not risen, neither shall we ever be raised*, but be utterly irrecoverably condemned to everlasting rottenness.

Prop. II. 30. And thus I am unawares fallen upon my second Proposition, Namely, *That by the Dominion and power of Christ, which at his Resurrection, and not before, he received as a reward of his great Humility, we are not only enabled to the performance of the conditions of this New Covenant, and, by consequence, made capeable of an actual application of his satisfaction; But also by the same power, we shall hereafter be raised up, and exalted unto everlasting Happiness.*

31. Though by the vertue of the Incarnation of our Saviour, the Humane Nature was raised to a state and condition of unspeakable glory: Notwithstanding, if in this place, as well as before, we shall be content to submit our Reason to Scripture, We shall find, that according to a Covenant made between Christ and his Father, he was content not to challenge

lenge to himself any right of Dominion and Rule over us, till he hath perfectly deserv'd and earn'd it by a former voluntary submission and humiliation of himself.

32. The conditions on Christ's part we find most exactly performed by him, wholly resigning and prostrating his own will to the will & disposition of his Father. At his private Passion, which immediately went before his Attachment, when he was sacrificed, and even crucified, alone in the Garden, without the assistance and malice of a trayterous Disciple, of the chief Priests or Romans: Though he retain'd that innocent fear of death and shame which is natural to Man, which forced him to cry out, *Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me:* Notwithstanding, though he could not hate his own life: yet, to shew he preferr'd the fulfilling of his Fathers will before it, he adds, *Nevertheless, not my will, but thy will be done:* By which words he resigns the whole power and faculty of his will into his Fathers hands. In the words of another Evangelist, he saith, *Not what I will, but what thou wilt:* Where he resigns and submits the Act and Exercise of his Will. And lastly, to make all compleat in the expression of a Third Evangelist, he saith, *Not as I will, but as thou wilt:* Where he subjects not only the faculty and the exercise of his will to the performance of what God shall command him, but is willing and desirous to do it after what manner and fashion soever God shall be pleased. It is not possible for the understanding of man to adde or conceive a degree beyond this.

Luk. 22. 42. Mark. 14. 36. Matth. 26 39.

33. In the next place we shall see, How God the Father is as good as his word to his Son: But, first, give me leave to complain to you of that Tyranny, which custom, partiality, or something worse, has laid upon our Understandings: And that is this, That whereso'ever any former Protestant Writer have suspected a Doctrin as not beneficial, but rather dangerous, to some conclusion, which he is resolved to maintain against the Papists, we their Scholars are oblig'd to make good their jealousies and (may be) groundless suspitions.

34. To omit many examples, I will produce only these few: It lies upon us to maintain, that St. *John*'s Baptism, was one and the same Sacrament with that of Christs, contrary to expres words of Scripture, and something else: That Christ is a Mediatour *Secundum Divinam Naturam:* which borders, I fear, upon an old dangerous Heresie. As likewise, (which especially concerns this place,) That Christ merited nothing to Himself by his Passion, neither was the Exaltation of his Humane Nature to the Dominion and Rule over all Creatures a reward of his Humility, but a preferment due to his Person, though by special dispensation the exercise thereof was deferr'd for a time, but should have been conferr'd upon him as fully as he now enjoys it, though he had never suffered.

35. But Scripture teacheth us, That *Christ was to be made perfect by sufferings:* That, *Because he had drunk of the Brook by the way, Therefore he should lift up his head:* That, *For the joy which was set before him,* (that is, Having an eye to the glorious reward and fruit of his suffering) *he endured the Cross, and despised the shame,* and therefore is set up at the right hand of Glory. *Because being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to the death, even the death of the Cross,* And, *Therefore,* for this reason, *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name,* &c. Nay, St. *Paul* makes the obtaining

Phil. 2. 8, 9.

a Rule

a Rule and Dominion over man-kind, a main end of his death, (for in Rom. 14. 9. he ſaith,) Εἰς τοῦτο, *For this end*; *Chriſt both dyed and roſe again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living.* By his death, meriting this Dominion; by his Reſurrection, receiving it. But I will forbear controverſie, becauſe I deſire to ſeek out no Adverſary, eſpecially in my preaching, but only the Devil and Sin.

36. This therefore I think; we ſhall agree upon, That it was the purpoſe and immutable decree of God, that after the fall and miſery of man, whatſoever good ſhould befal us toward our reſtitution and repairing to our loſt happineſs, ſhould be convey'd unto us by our own nature, *That the Seed of the Woman ſhould break the Serpent's head*; That is, not only in St. *John's* phraſe, deſtroy the works of the Devil, but alſo in St. *Paul's*, deſtroy his kingdom and power, which is Death. So that, *As by Man came Sin and Error, ſo by Man alſo ſhould come Grace and Truth: As by Man came Death, ſo by Man alſo ſhould come the Reſurrection from the dead*; By Man alſo, life and immortality ſhould be brought to light.

37. Now that theſe great projects and entendments might be brought about, and that the Humane Nature might be furniſh'd with ability to diſcharge this Province, and to go through with this great Undertaking: God the Father, for the merit of Chriſt's great humility, by his Reſurrection, Eph. 1. 20. *hath highly exalted him farr above all Principality and Power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world,* Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *but alſo in that which is to come:* And *hath given him a Name above all Names, that at the Name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus is the Lord to the glory of God the Father.*

38. And thus much Chriſt himſelf confeſſeth, and acknowledgeth preſently upon his Reſurrection for then he ſaith, *All power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth.* It was then only he received the Dominion, whereof his Father *David*'s Kingdom was but a Type and ſhadow: And as his Father *David* was anointed and deputed by God to the Kingdom, but received not actual poſſeſſion of it till after many perſecutions and afflictions at the hands of his Maſter *Saul*: In like manner, though our Saviour even in the days of his humility, teacheth us, that the *Father judgeth no man, but reſigneth all judgment to the Son*: Notwithſtanding theſe words are to be underſtood only by way of Anticipation, or Prophecy of what ſhould befal him, after he ſhould have perform'd the work of our Redemption: For while he lived here among men, he profeſſed he was ſo farr from being a King, that he had no ſufficient authority given him to be a petty Judg in a caſe of Inheritance: And that wicked *Pilat* himſelf had power given him from Heaven to become his Judg: So that, though in the days of his fleſh, he was Heir of all things, yet he was only a conditional heir, and therefore till the conditions were perform'd, and himſelf ſeiz'd of the Inheritance, even the Heir himſelf differed nothing from a Servaut.

39. But within three days after his Paſſion, the caſe was much altered. For, whereas before he was allowed no Authority, no, not in *Iſrael*; At his Reſurrection, he obtains the Heathen for his Inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the Earth for his Poſſeſſion. Now it would be a hard undertaking

taking to describe the limits and borders of Christ's Kingdom; as also to define the Polity, whereby it is administred. Therefore, leaving the most glorious part of it, which is in Heaven, undiscovered; we find in Holy Scripture, that according to the several dispositions and qualifications of men here on earth, He hath both a Scepter of righteousness to govern and protect his faithful subjects and servants; and a rod of Iron, to break the wicked in pieces like a potter's vessel. And though the greatest part of the world will acknowledge no subjection to Christ's Kingdom; notwithstanding, this does not take away his authority over them, no more than the murmuring, and rebellion of the Israelites did depose *Moses* their Governour. But there will come a time, when that Prophetical Parable of his, shall be resolved, and interpreted to their confusion; when he shall indeed say, *Where are those my enemies, which would not have me to reign over them? Bring them hither, and slay them before me.*

40. But the most eminent and notorious exercise of Christs Dominion, is seen in the rule over his Church, which he purchased with his own Bloud: Now the first business he took in hand, presently upon his Resurrection, when all power and dominion was given him, was, to give commission and authority to his Embassadours the Apostles and Disciples, to make known to the world, that so great salvation which he had wrought at his Passion. Now though the Apostles were sufficiently authorised, by vertue of that Commission which Christ gave them in those words; *As my Father sent me, so send I you* —— Notwithstanding they were not to put this authority presently in practise, but to wait for the sending of the Holy Ghost, which Christ before had promised them: That by his virtue and influence they might be furnished with abilities to go through with that great employment of reconciling the world unto God, by subduing mens understandings to the truth and obedience of the Gospel.

41. We read in the Gospel of *S. John*, that, during the life which Christ lived in the flesh, *the Holy Ghost was not sent*: and the reason is added, *Because the Son of man was not yet glorified.* The strength and vigour of which reason, doth excellently illustrate the point in hand. For the sending of the Holy Ghost, was one of the most glorious acts of Christs Kingly Office, and the most powerful means of advancing his Kingdom. Therefore, in the dates of his humiliation, whilest he lived in the form of a servant, before he had purchased to himself a Church by his own Bloud, his Humane Nature obtain'd no right of dominion and power over Mankind. For till we were redeemed from the power and subjection of the Devil, and sin, by the merit of Christs Death, we were none of Christs subjects, but servants and slaves, sold under sin and Satan.

42. So that it being necessary, that the Son of man should not only pay a price and ransome for our Redemption by his Death, but also, that the same Son of man, and none else, should actually and powerfully vindicate his elect from the bondage they were in, and effectually apply his merits and satisfaction to their souls and consciences; Till he was in *S. Paul's* words, Διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, *For the suffering of death, crown'd with glory and honour*; He, according to his Heb. 11. 9.

Humane Nature (and that was the only inſtrument whereby our Salvation was to be wrought) had no power of ſending the Holy Ghoſt.

43. And indeed till Reconciliation was made by his Death, to what purpoſe ſhould the Holy Ghoſt be ſent? What buſineſs or employment could we find for him on earth? You will ſay, to work grace and new obedience in us. I confeſs, that is a work worthy the Majeſty and goodneſs of Gods holy Spirit. But yet, ſuppoſe all this had been wrought in us; put caſe, our hearts were ſprinkled from an evil conſcience, and that we were renewed in the ſpirits of our minds. Perhaps, all this might procure us a more tolerable cool place and climate in Hell: But without Chriſt, it would be far from advantaging us toward our ſalvation: for, alas, though we ſhould turn never ſo holy, never ſo vertuous and reformed: what ſatisfaction or recompence could we make for our former ſins and iniquities? God knows, it muſt coſt more to redeem a ſoul, therefore we muſt let that alone for ever; we muſt take heed of ever medling in that office, we muſt let it alone to him (even Jeſus Chriſt) who alone is able to be at that coſt.

44. But I might have ſpared all theſe ſuppoſitions: For, as, excluding Chriſt, there is no ſatisfaction, no hope of redemption for us; ſo, excluding Chriſts ſatisfaction, he hath no power or authority, as Man, of ſending the Holy Ghoſt, thereby to work in us an ability of performing the conditions of the ſecond Covenant; and, by conſequence, of making us capable of the fruit and benefit of his ſatisfaction. Therefore, bleſſed be God the Father, for the great glory which he gave unto Chriſt; And bleſſed be our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, for meriting and purchaſing that Glory at ſo dear a rate; And bleſſed be the Holy Spirit, who, when Chriſt (who is *fleſh of our fleſh, and bone of our bone*) did ſend him, would be content to come down and dwell among us.

45. We find in Holy Scripture, that our Salvation is aſcribed to all the Three Perſons of the bleſſed Trinity, though in ſeveral reſpects: To the Father, who accepts of Chriſts Satisfaction, and offereth pardon of all our ſins: To the Son, who merited and procured Reconciliation for his elect faithful ſervants; And to the Holy Ghoſt the Comforter, who, being ſent by the Son, worketh in us power to perform the conditions of the New Covenant, thereby qualifying us for receiving actual remiſſion of our ſins, and a right to that glorious Inheritance purchaſed for us.

46. And from hence may appear, How full of danger the former Doctrine, which teacheth, that actual remiſſion of ſins is procured to Gods Elect immediately by Chriſts death; and how diſhonourable it is to the Spirit of Grace, excluding him from having any concurrence or efficacy in our Salvation. For, if this ſhould be true, the powerful working of the Holy Spirit, can in no ſenſe, concern either our Juſtification, or everlaſting happineſs. For, how can it be ſaid, that the Holy Spirit doth co-operate to our Salvation, ſince all our good and happineſs was procured by Chriſts death; not only before, but without all manner of reſpect had to our Regeneration and Sanctification, by the power of the bleſſed Spirit. Therefore by this Doctrine, if we be any thing at all beholding to the Holy Spirit, it is only for this, that he is

pleaſed

pleaſed, now and then, by fits, to be a meſſenger, or intelligencer, to diſcover unto us what Chriſt alone hath purchaſed for us.

47. But I forbear to enlarge my ſelf further in this point; and indeed I have already done too much wrong to the honour and dignity of this Feaſt, not only in mixing the buſineſs of Good-Friday with it, as I did in my former part; but alſo (as I now have done) in taking in the matter and imployment of Whitſuntide too. Suffice it therefore, that the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt, was an eſpecial exerciſe of that power, which was given Chriſt at his Reſurrection; by the influence and virtue whereof, we do reſtrain and appropriate the merit of his Death to our own good and benefit.

48. Now I would not be miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that the Reſurrection of Chriſt preciſely taken for that individual action whereby he was reſtored to life and glory, was then effectual and powerful to produce thoſe admirable effects: For, that being a Tranſient action, paſt and finiſhed many hundred years ſince, can very improperly be termed capable of having ſuch effects aſcribed to it as have ſince, and ſhall to the end of the world be wrought in Gods Elect. Therefore S. *Paul* ſhall be mine Interpreter, in *Rom.* 5. 10. ſaying, *If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we ſhall be ſaved by his life*; that is, By that glorious Life which began at his Reſurrection. Rom. 5. 10.

49. For, as in the matter of Satisfaction, we aſcribe our reconciliation to his Death eſpecially, yet not excluding his former Obedience and Humiliation; but naming that, as being the complement and perfection, terminating whatſoever went before: So likewiſe in Chriſts exaltation, though there were divers degrees, and aſcents, and ſtages of it; yet we eſpecially take notice of his Reſurrection, becauſe in that Chriſt took his riſe as it were, and was then *a Bridegroom coming out of his chamber, rejoycing as a Gyant to run his race. His goings out indeed were from the Grave, but his Circuit is to the ends of Heaven, and nothing is hid from his heat and virtue.* He illuminates every man that cometh into the world: *He was made*, ſaith S. *Paul*, *a quickning Spirit*, cherithing, actuating, and informing us with life and motion. By the influence and power of his life, he undergoes, as it were, a ſecond Incarnation, living and dwelling in our hearts by his Grace, and reigning powerfully in our ſouls by Faith. Pſal. 19.

50. And hereby he even ſhares his Kingdom, his Power, and his Victory with us: For, ſaith S. *John*, *This is the victory whereby ye overcome the world, even your Faith.* Chriſt is not content only to deſtroy in us, the works of darkneſs; to diſpel the clouds of ignorance and errour, or to rectifie the crookedneſs and perverſeneſs of our wills: neither yet to implant in us a heavie, unactive, ſleepy harmleſneſs, a dull lethargick innocence; but withal, indues us, *Juſtitiâ germinante*, with a fruitful budding righteouſnes, and works in us, in the expreſſion of S. *Paul*, both ὑπομονὴν τῆς ἐλπίδος, a patient unwearied hope, not haſty nor diſcontented with expecting; and κόπον τῆς ἀγάπης, a painful, laborious love, and ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, a working, ſprightful victorious Faith, whereby we violently lay hold on the promiſes. And, in this ſenſe, the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, that as *Chriſt died for our ſins, ſo he roſe again for our Juſti-* 1 Theſſ. 1. 3. Rom. 4. 24.

ſtication: that is, one chief end of Chriſts Reſurrection, in reſpect of us, was to work in us a lively faith, whereby we might be juſtified, and acquitted from our ſins.

51. And yet the Power of Chriſts Life, leaves us not here neither: Nay, all this is performed only to make us capable of greater bleſſings yet. For, by our ſanctification and new-birth, we are (ſaith *Tertullian*) *Reſtitutioni inaugurati*, deſtin'd and conſecrated to a glorious Reſurrection. Hereupon S. *John* calls holineſs, the firſt Reſurrection whereby ſin is deſtroy'd: And it is a pawn of the ſecond, whereby Death alſo ſhall be ſwallowed up in victory. By the firſt, the ſting of the Serpent is taken away, which is ſin, (as S. *Paul* ſaith, *The ſting of death is ſin*). And when the ſting is gone, the Serpent cannot long out-live it; for by the ſecond Reſurrection, that alſo is deſtroyed.

Tertul. de Reſ. carnis.

52. But you will ſay, How is Death deſtroyed? Do not all men dye? Do not all men ſee corruption? You may as well ask, How is ſin deſtroyed? For, have not all men ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God? Nay, Do not all men ſin, how righteous ſoever? And, if they were rewarded according to their own demerits, would they not all come ſhort of the glory of God? Moſt certainly true: Therefore to ſay the truth, As yet, neither Sin nor Death are deſtroy'd, but only the Dominion of Sin, and the Victory of the Grave. And thereupon the Apoſtle contemplating the conquering power of Chriſt at his Reſurrection, ſaith not, Oh Death, or, Oh Grave, where are you? for a little travel would ſerve the turn to aſſoyl that queſtion: But, *Oh Death, where is thy ſting?* How comes it to paſs, that thy poyſon is not ſo keen and mortal, as it hath been; that it is ſo eaſily, though not expell'd, yet tempered and corrected by the healing Bezoartical virtue of Grace. And thou, *Oh Grave, where is thy victory?* Though thou haſt given thine adverſary the foyl, though thou haſt gotten him under thee yet thou ſhalt never be able to detain him long: For, *behold, a little while, and he that ſhall come, will come, and will not tarry:* He will ranſack the moſt private reſerved corners of thy Treaſury; and though thou mayeſt conſume and devour our bodies, yet he will force thee to vomit and diſgorge them again; he will not leave one portion, one morſel of them in thy ſtomach and entrails.

1 Cor. 15. 55.

53. I know, the ingenuous and learned *Pareus*, becauſe he would not ſuffer any portion of the merit of Chriſt's Death to be extended and meant to the ungodly; or, that He, by the fruit of his Paſſion, ſhould obtain any power over them, will therefore, conſequently, exclude them from the efficacy and power of his Reſurrection and Life: He will not allow them to be raiſed by the power of Chriſt, but only by the Juſtice of God to their own condemnation: So that, by his reckoning, the great buſineſs and work of the laſt day, ſhall not wholly lye upon Chriſt's hands to perform, but ſhall be parted, and ſhared between the Power of Chriſt, and the Juſtice of God.

54. I am confidently perſwaded, S. *Paul* in this point was not of his mind, when he ſaith, *As in Adam all have dyed, ſo by Chriſt ſhall all* (All, without exception) *be made alive again.* And, *As by man came death, ſo by Man alſo cometh the Reſurrection of the Dead.* Indeed, I wonder *Pareus* would not likewiſe find ſome ſhift to exclude Chriſt, as well

well from being a Judge to condemn the wicked: For with as much reason, and as great ease, he might have given him a Writ of Ease, a discharge from that Office, as well as the other.

55. And now I could wish I had said nothing all this while: (and likely enough so could you): But it grieves me, that the portion of time allowed me, will not suffer me in any reasonable proportion to contemplate the wonderful mercy and goodness of God; who, to do us good, has given such power to our Nature in Christ, to make a new Heaven, and a new Earth, to restore a new Generation of creatures, ten times more glorious and perfect than the first. Only, now tell me; Did not S. *Paul*, with good reason, speaking of the Resurrection of Christ, give it an advantage and pre-eminence, even above his death? Is not the Μᾶλλον δὲ in my Text, the, *Yea rather, verbum* Τελεστικὸν, a word of great moment and weight? Since the Resurrection of Christ, actuates and ripens the fruit of Christs Death, which, without it, would have withered, and been of no help to us. Is not the Doctrine of Christs Resurrection and exaltation, with as good reason made an Article of our Creed; and as necessarily, if not rather, to be lean'd upon, as any of the rest? Nay, hath not S. *Paul* epitomized the whole Creed into that one Article, saying (in *Rom.* 10. 9.) *If thou shalt believe in thine heart, that God raised the Lord Jesus from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* Rom. 10. 9.

56. And now 'tis time to consider, who are the persons whom the Death, yea rather, the Resurrection of Christ, will protect and warrant from condemnation. In my Text, as we find none to condemn, so likewise, we cannot light upon any to be condemned. In the verse immediately before these words, the Elect of God, are those which are Justified, and therefore must not be condemned. And, to say the truth, though we dispute till the worlds end, the event will shew, that the Elect of God, and only they, shall reap the harvest of Christ's sufferings, and bring their sheaves with them. As for the wicked and Reprobates, it shall not be so with them: but why it shall not be so with them, whether, because they have wilfully excluded themselves, or, because God had no mind they should be any thing the better for these things, I will not tell you.

57. In the verses on both sides of my Text, we find, that, We are those that must not be condemn'd: We? which we? why *Paul* and the *Romans*, *Jews* and *Gentiles*. What all *Jews*, and all *Gentiles*? I told you I will not tell: Only thus much let me tell you, we may boldly maintain S. *Paul*'s phrase: nay, it is unsafe, and dangerous to alter it. Why, it is all the comfort we have to live by, it is our glory and crown of rejoycing, that we are those whose salvation Christ did so earnestly and unfeignedly desire, and thirst after; that, to obtain power and authority to bestow it on us, he suffered such torments and blasphemies, that, *Never sorrow was like unto his sorrow, which was done unto him, wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce wrath.*

58. Wherefore, I beseech you (Beloved Brethren) even by the bowels of this Jesus Christ, that you would give me leave to advise you, if there be any here fit to be advised by me, if there be any in this company as weak and ignorant as my self: (And though my heart be deceitful above all things, yet as far as I understand mine own heart, If I speak these

words out of partiality or faction, let me be excluded from having my part in those merits.) I say, let me desire you: or rather, let our holy Mother the Church, perswade you (in the 17. Article) to receive Gods promises in such wise, as they are generally set forth unto us in holy Scriptures?

59. For, consider impartially with your selves, what an unreasonable horrible thing is it, seeing there are so many several frequent expressions of Gods general love and gracious favour unto Mankind, inforc'd and strengthned with such protestations and solemn oaths, that the cunning'st Linguist of you all, cannot with your whole lives, study, conceive, or frame expressions more full and satisfactory. I say then, Is it not desperate madness, for a man to shew such hatred and abomination at these comfortable and gracious professions of God, that he can be content to spend almost his whole age in contriving and hunting after Interpretations, utterly contradicting and destroying the plain apparent sense of those Scriptures: and will be glad and heartily comforted to hear tidings of a New-found out Glos's to pervert, and rack, and torment, Gods holy word.

60. On the other side; Far be it from us to think, that it is in our power, when we list or have a mind to it, to put our selves in the number of Gods elect faithful servants. Or, to imagine, that we have God so sure chain'd and fettered to us by his Promises, that we may dispense now then for the commission of a delightful, gainful crime: Or, that when we have business for a sin to advantage us in our fortunes, we need not be too scrupulous about it, seeing God is bound, upon our sorrow and contrition, to receive us again into favour. Thou wretched Fool! Darest thou make an advantage of Gods goodness, to assist and patronize thy security? 'Tis true, God has promised Remission of sins to a repentant contrite sinner: but has he assur'd thee that he will give thee Repentance, whensoever thou pleasest to allow thy self leisure to seek it? No: Know, that there is a time (and presuming Security, like sleep, doth hasten and add wings to that time) when there will be found no way for Repentance, though thou seekest it with tears. And thus more than I meant for the persons.

61. And now what remains, but that we try an experiment: That we may know in what a comfortable state Christ hath set us; let us consider, and look about us, to see if we can find any enemies that are likely to do us any harm: For which purpose, we shall not meet with a more accurate Spy and Intelligencer than S. *Paul*: who in the remainder of his Chapter, after my Text, hath mustered them together in one Roll. But first, there is one, if he were our adversary, he would be in stead of a thousand enemies unto us, and that is God. But him we are sure of in the verse before my Text: For it is he that Justifies, therefore surely he will not condemn: Therefore what say you to *Tribulation, or Distress, or Persecution, or Famine, or Nakedness, or Peril, or the Sword?* Why these are not worthy the naming, for over all these we are *more than conquerours*. More than conquerours; what is that? Why they are not only overcome and disarm'd, but they are brought over to our faction; they war on our side.

62. Well, in the next file, there follow adverſaries of better faſhion; there is Life, and Death, and Angels, and Principalities, and Powers, (who are thoſe? In truth I know not; but be they who they will, they can do us no harm:) No, nor things preſent, nor things to come, nor heighth, nor depth; (Theſe are adverſaries we ſhould ſcarce have dream'd of). And to make all ſure, in a word, There is no other creature ſhall ever be able to ſeparate us from the love of God, which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.

63. Yet for all S. *Paul*'s exactneſs, there remains one enemy behind, and that is a ſore one, of prime note; and truly I wonder how the Apoſtle could miſs him. And that is Sin. I would to God S. *Paul* had taken notice of him: For this one enemy is able to do us more harm than all the reſt put together: nay, but for ſin, all the reſt almoſt were our very good friends. Had we beſt ſupply S. *Paul*'s incogitancy, and even adventure to put him in the Catalogue too? Well, let them that have a mind to it, do it; Truly, I dare not. And, but that I know *Martin Luther* was a bold-ſpirited man, I ſhould wonder how he durſt ſo confidently have adventured upon it: In his Book entituled *Captivitatis Babylonicæ* (*cap. de Baptiſmo*, near the beginning) he hath theſe words: *Vides quam dives ſit homo Chriſtianus ſive Baptizatus, qui etiam volens non poteſt perdere ſuam ſalutem quantiſcunque peccatis, niſi nolit credere.* I will not tranſlate them to you: and I would they had never been Engliſhed; for by that means, it may be, ſome of our loudeſt preachers would have wanted one point of comfortable falſe doctrine, wherewith they are wont to pleaſure their friends and benefactors. Only, let us do thus much for S. *Paul*'s credit, to believe it was not meerly inconſideration in him to leave out Sin in this catalogue; that there was ſome ground of Reaſon for it: For though it may come to paſs, by the mercy and goodneſs of God, That even Sin it ſelf ſhall not pluck us out of his hand; yet it would be ſomething a ſtrange prepoſterous Doctrine, for a Preacher of the New Covenant, to proclaim, that we ſhall undoubtedly obtain the promiſes of the Covenant, though we never ſo much break the Conditions.

64. I do confeſs my ſelf very guilty, and am ſorry that I have thus long exerciſed and wearied your patience: And yet, for all that, have not perform'd that task which I fully reſolv'd upon, when I adventured upon this ſubject; and that was, to ſpend this time in raiſing your devotions to the contemplation of the glorious mercies of God, expreſſed to us in Chriſts Reſurrection and exaltation. But becauſe other thoughts have carried me away (even againſt my will) almoſt all this while, I ſhall further take leave to wrong and injure your patience, with propoſing one conſideration more, which ought by no means to be omitted.

65. And that is, to take notice of the Perſon, to whom we have been beholding for theſe unſpeakable mercies; and that is Chriſt, Chriſt alone, none elſe mentioned or thought upon. If *Bellarmine* had been to adviſe S. *Paul*, if he had been privy to the writing of this Epiſtle, it is likely he would not have taken it ill, to have had Chriſts name in the matter of our Salvation: But he would not have endured the Apoſtles utter ſilence of all helps and aids beſides: yea, though himſelf acknowlegeth it to be the ſafeſt courſe, to put our whole confidence, only in the mercy of God; yet, *quia magis honorificum eſt habere aliquid ex merito*, becauſe

it

it concerns our credit, to put in a little for merit and desert on our side. He would not have us so to disparage our selves, as to make salvation a meer Alms, proceeding meerly out of Courtesie.

66. Nay but, Oh thou man, What art thou that answerest against God? What art thou that justifiest thy self before him? Nay, what art thou that condemnest God, making him a lyar all the Scripture over? the whole project whereof is this, to let us know, how unable, how sick, how dead we are of our selves, and therefore ought most necessarily to have recourse to him for our salvation. As for us (Beloved Christians) if we must needs rejoyce, let us rejoyce in our infirmities, let our glory be our shame, and let us lift up
Is. 63. 1, 2. our eyes and behold; *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with died garments from Bozrah; This* that is *glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?* And Christ will say, *It is I that speak in righteousnesse, mighty to save:* But, *wherefore*, Lord, *art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fatt?* He will answer, *I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me:* for which reason I am now crown'd with glory, and honour, and immortality: I alone am mighty to save, and besides me there is none other.

Ps. 45. 67. And *good luck have thou with thine honour, Oh Lord: ride on, because of thy word of truth, of meekness, and of righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things:* Terrible things for the King's enemies, for them which would not have thee to rule over them. And good luck have we with thine honour, O Lord: ride on, because of thy word of truth, of meekness, and of righteousness, and thy right hand shall teach thee gracious and comfortable things for us thy servants, and sheep of thy pasture; who dare not exalt a weak arm of flesh against thee. Thy right hand shall mightily defend us in the midst of all our enemies. Thy right hand shall find us out, and gather us up, though lost and consum'd in the grave; though scattered before the four winds of heaven: And, thy right hand shall exalt us to glory and immortality for ever with thee in thy heavenly Kingdom: where all the daies of our life, yea all the daies of thy glorious endless life, we shall, with Angels and Archangels, say, *Glory, and honour, and power, and immortality, be unto him which sitteth on the throne; and to the Lamb, and to the Holy Spirit, for ever, and for ever. Amen, Amen.*

The Sixth Sermon.

Luke XVI. 9.

Make to your ſelves friends of the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlaſting habitations.

THE *Children of this world* (ſaith Chriſt) *are wiſer in their generation then the Children of Light.* To make which good, our Saviour, in ſomuch of the Chapter as goes before my Text, brings in a Story, or, as they call it, a Parable of a cunning Fellow, yet no great Projector neither, no very ſubtile Polititian; notwithſtanding, one who being in an extremity, turn'd out of his Office for miſpending his Maſters Goods, had found out a ſhift, and that by meer couſenage, to procure ſo much as would ſerve to keep him, indeed not according to the Port and faſhion after which before he had liv'd; but only to maintain him in meat and drink, out of danger of ſtarving, or, which was more fearful, becauſe more full of trouble or diſhonour, hard labour or begging.

2. Surely it had been no hard matter for our Saviour, who knew all whatſoever was in man, to have diſcover'd more ſubtil projects, plots of a finer and more curious contrivance than this fellow's: But this, it ſeems, would ſerve his turn well enough for the purpoſe, for which he made uſe of it! And to ſay the truth, there cannot be imagined an example more exactly ſuiting, more cloſely applicable to his entent, which was not to diſcredit and diſhearten his followers, by comparing, I, and preferring the cunning of an ordinary fellow, a meer Bayliffe, or Steward, before that ſpiritual heavenly wiſdom to which they pretend: Nor, Secondly, to inſtruct them by indirect and unwarrantable courſes to provide for themſelves hereafter. But chiefly this,

3. To teach us, by objecting to our view, a man who by his own negligence, and careleſneſs, being brought to an extremity (for there was no neceſſity he ſhould be brought to theſe plunges; a little timely care and providence, even ordinary honeſty, would eaſily have warranted and preſerved him) had upon the ſudden found out a trick of his Office, namely,

by

by proceeding in his old courſes of waſting his Maſter's ſubſtance to the enriching of his Fellow-ſervants, thereby gained their good wills, that for the time following they might preſerve him from periſhing.

4. Our Saviour, I ſay, by this example, would teach us, That ſince God has plac'd us here in this world as his Stewards, has put into our hands, his Goods, his Riches, to be diſpenſed for his uſe and advantage: And ſuch Stewards (we are) who have advantages infinitely more urgent and preſſing us to an honeſt faithful diſcharge of our Office, than this man in the Parable ever had; As firſt, We muſt of neceſſity fail, and be caſhier'd of our Office. All the power of Heaven and Earth cannot procure us a perpetuity in it: The caſe did not ſtand ſo with this man, for it was meerly his own fault to deſerve diſcarding; and beſides, having deſerv'd that cenſure, it was his misfortune too, that his Lord ſhould come to the knowledge of it, (for it is no impoſſible thing, that a Steward ſhould thrive by his Lords loſs, and yet nere be call'd to an account for it.) And ſecondly, upon our behaviour in this our Office, depends the everlaſting welfare of our ſouls and bodies; we ſhall for ever be diſpos'd of, according to the honeſt, or unfaithful diſcharge of our place: If ill, Lord what ſhall become of us? where ſhall we appear in that great day of account? I dare not almoſt tell you the iſſue of it: But if we have carryed our ſelves as faithful Servants; propoſe to your ſelves your own conditions, give your thoughts licenſe and ſcope to be exceſſive and over-flowing in their deſires, if the whole extenſion and capacity of your thoughts be not ſatisfied and fill'd to the brim with meaſure preſſed down and running over, God himſelf (which is impoſsible to imagin) will prove a deceiving unfaithful Maſter.

5. Theſe things therefore conſidered, without queſtion, it doth infinitely concern us to conſult, and project, what we mean to do with our riches, to what employment we intend to put thoſe honours, and that power which God hath conferr'd on us in this life: Whether to receive them as our good things, to go away contented with them as our Rewards, our final rewards, expecting no other good things from God after them: Or, which is our Saviours advice, uſe them as means, & helps of attaining bleſsings above all conceivable proportion exceeding them; ſo diſpenſing & providently ſcattering them abroad, that againſt our time of need, (which ſooner or later will undoubtedly come) we may oblige to our ſelves ſuch friends, ſo gracious, and prevailing with our Maſter, who, either by their Prayers and Interceſsion, or ſome other way which we know not, may procure for us admiſsion into our Maſter's joys, to be no longer Stewards and Servants, but Friends and Sons: Thus by the help and benefit of this *Mammon of unrighteouſneſs* in my Text, *theſe little things*, even the leaſt bleſsings that God has to beſtow upon us, ſo called in the verſe following, and in the next but one to that, theſe *things of other men*, as if they were trifles, not worthy the owning if compar'd with what rewards may be had in exchange for them, purchaſing to our ſelves everlaſting and glorious rewards; By the aſsiſtance of our Riches (in the expreſsion of St. *Paul*), *laying up for our ſelves a foundation of good works againſt the time to come, that we may lay hold on eternal life.*

6. And this I ſuppoſe to be the force and meaning of this ἐπιμύθιον, or moral of the Parable, which Chriſt hath cloſely contriv'd and preſs'd into

to

to these few words, *Make to your selves friends of the*, &c. In which words, I shall observe unto you these three general parts.

1. What we must expect at last, notwithstanding all the Riches and Pomps of this world, *i. e. To fail.* Christ you see makes no question at all of it, he takes it for granted, where he says, *That when ye fail*, as implying, that certainly fail we must.
2. This being suppos'd, that fail we must, the counsel of Christ comes in very seasonably, namely, to provide for the main, to take order, that though we our selves sink, yet we may procure us friends to support us in our necessities, and that is *by making to our selves friends of the Mammon*, &c.
3. The comfortable issue and convenience which shall accrew unto us by those friends thus purchased, *i.e.* by them *to be received into everlasting*, &c. Of these, in the order proposed.

7. You do not expect, I am sure, that I should go about seriously to perswade you, that you shall not live here for ever; For, whom should I seek to perswade? God forbid, I should be so uncharitable, as to think, or, but suspect, that ever I should find occasion to make use of any perswasions for such a purpose. Indeed a very good man (it was the Prophet *David*) once said *In his prosperity, I shall never be removed, Thou Lord of thy goodness hast made my hill so strong:* But was this well said of him, think you? It seems not: For presently to confute this his confidence, *The Lord did but turn his face away from him, and he was troubled.* Yet surely such a speech as this could never be spoken upon better grounds; for this his assurance, it seems, proceeded not out of any presumptuous confidence of his own strength or policy: But only out of consideration of God's especial Providence show'd in his wonderful preservation from many great and imminent dangers, and in preferring him from a low contemptible fortune to the Rule and Dominion over his People. *Part.* I. Psal. 30. 6. Vers. 7.

8. There is another fellow in a Parable, who though he came short of *David*, in this his unwarrantable confidence and presumption upon that foundation of Riches and Wealth, which with unwearied anxiety and care he had laid up, notwithstanding was more suddenly and unanswerably confuted: For, he did not promise to himself a perpetuity, only he imagin'd to himself (as he thought, reasonably,) that since he had at last obtain'd that which he had aim'd at, and which had cost him so many years travel, it were fit for him now to enjoy the fruit which he had so dearly bought. And in a joyful contemplation of this his happiness he enters into Dialogue with his soul, *Soul*, saith he, now *take thy rest.* No more shalt thou be vexed, and even consum'd with the painful and violent thirst after Riches, thou hast that laid up for thee which shall abundantly satisfie all thy desires. All my business hereafter, shall be to find out ways how to repay unto my soul all those pleasures which heretofore I have deny'd unto my self; I have store sufficient for many years expences safely laid up in my Barns: Yet for all this man's thus pleasing himself with assured promises of many years happiness; If you will but vouchsafe to enquire after him the very next day after he spoke thus, His garners it is likely you may yet find standing, throng'd and oppress'd with the abundance of corn. But for his soul (for whose sake all this ado had been kept) the Lord knows what became of that, it was hurried away, no man can tell, whither. Luk. 12.

9. Now

9. Now the thing that it becomes me to desire at your hands from the consideration of these two Examples, is this, not to require of you to believe that you must once fail (for that I suppose were needless) nor yet to disswade you from allowing to your selves a reasonable use & moderate lawful pleasures from that abundance of blessings wherewith God hath enriched you beyond all other men. But to beseech you, that this meditation, that certainly you must fail, may be no unwelcome thought to you, that when the time shall come that you must leave these riches and pleasures which God has given you here to enjoy, it may not come upon you as an unexpected misfortune, as a thing you were afraid of, and would willingly be content to avoid.

10. I confess, this were a meditation sufficient to discourage and quite dishearten a man that were resolv'd to take up his rest in the pleasures and preferments of this world, that were content to sit down satisfi'd with such a sleight happiness, as this life is able to afford him; for one who would make Riches his strong City, a place of refuge and security, a fortress whereto he would have recourse in all his extremities, and from whence he would expect safety in all dangers and troubles which may assail him: For, what were that, but to withdraw him from his strong holds, & leave him unfortified and expos'd to any injury and misfortune! How could I be more injurious to such a man, then to vex and affright him with such sad melancholick thoughts as these, That the time will come, when that strong Castle of his, his Riches, shall be undermin'd and demolish'd, when he shall be left naked and defenceless. At which time, if it were possible for him to retain his Riches, which before he made his Bulwark and place of Security, yet he will find them then but Paper-Wals, unable to stand the weakest battery.

11. But I hope better things of you, (Beloved Christians) even things which accompany salvation: And indeed, why should I not? who can forbid me to hope so? For alas, I know you not. I have no reason to assure my self of the contrary. And then I should be most inexcusably uncharitable, if I should not even rejoyce in this my hope: I see God hath plentifully showr'd down upon you, almost overwhelm'd you with all the blessings of this life. He has moreover given you peaceable times to enjoy them; (Blessed be his holy Name for it, and a thousand blessings be returned into the bosom of his Anointed for his most pious Christian-like care to confirm this peace, and to preserve it from interruption.) God, I say, has given you leisure and opportunity to enjoy and improve these your riches for your everlasting happiness: A comfort which he has denyed almost to all other Nations; Nothing abroad but warrs, and rumors of warrs, no joy nor comfort but only in the effusion of precious Christian bloud, nothing but sacking of Towns and Invasions of Countreys, God only knows upon how just pretensions. But, which is above all other blessings, (indeed without which all the rest will prove very curses) God has given you an abundant p'entiful use of his blessed Word and Sacraments, every week, several times (till now) a worthy and able Clergy to put you in mind, how great an account you are to make to Almighty God of these his blessings, and what extraordinary Interest is expected at your hands.

12. Let me not therefore, I beseech you, be your Enemy, if I prove troublesome to any slumbring Lethargick Spirit, if I put him in mind, that the time will come, when sleep shall for ever depart from his eyes, and that if his slumber last till a Trumpet awake him, darkness he may find, most palpable

palpable *Ægyptian*-darkneſs, but not darkneſs commodious to call on and procure ſleep, not very convenient to take ones reſt in. Forgive, I beſeech you, my importunity, if I earneſtly deſire you frequently to repreſent to your minds a time of Failing, and preſently after that a ſevere inexorable Judge, requiring a ſtrict exact account of your behaviour in your Stewardſhip; if I beſeech you, from the conſideration of the fooliſh Virgins, not to put farr from you the coming of the Bridegroom, not to frame to your ſelves reaſons and probabilities, why he is not likely to come yet a good while, (for he himſelf has told you, he will come as a Thief in the Night, and therefore when you are thus ſecure and ſlumbring, your ſelves create a night, a fit ſeaſon for him to come unawares upon you.) For, if you be unprovided of Oyl in your Lamps, of good works which may ſhine before men, and the dore be once ſhut, Talk not of any new devis'd Faith, and I know not what aſſurance; there is no poſſibility of ever having it opened, but you ſhall be forc'd to remain expos'd to all dangers, to all manner of misfortunes, not one ſhall be found to befriend you, and to receive you into everlaſting habitations.

13. And, I pray you, conſider, that if the apprehenſion of theſe things conceiv'd not as preſent, but as to be expected, it may be, many years hence, be ſo diſtaſtful and ominous to fleſh and bloud, Who will be able to abide the time, when it ſhall, indeed, overtake him? If now in theſe days of leiſure and forbearance (a ſeaſon which God out of his glorious mercy hath allow'd us on purpoſe to ſpend in ſuch thoughts as theſe, in projecting againſt the evil day) the meditation thereof bring ſuch anguiſh and torment along with it; what terrible inſupportable effects will it work in us, when we ſhall find our ſelves ſurpriz'd by it, and caught as in a ſnare? If a man can no ſooner hear ſuch things related, or but ſeriouſly think upon them, though in the height of his jollity, but ſtraight, as if ſome ill news had been told him; as if he had heard ſome ſad tragical ſtory of his own misfortunes, he will preſently recoil from his mirth, pleaſure will become troubleſome and diſtaſtful to him; Oh with what anguiſh and vexation of ſpirit, with what agony of ſoul ſhall they be entertained, when they come in earneſt?

14. Obſerve therefore, I beſeech you, that our Saviour does not bid you, When you fail make to your ſelves friends; No alas, that is not the time to make friends in; Then is the ſeaſon when you are to expect comfort and aſſiſtance from thoſe friends which you have gain'd before, in the time when you were furniſh'd with ſuch good things as were likely to oblige men unto you. What title then can be found out equal to expreſs the folly and madneſs of ſuch people; who, as if God had created them on purpoſe for the pleaſures and vanities of this world, make that the whole buſineſs of their lives; and, as if the care of their ſouls everlaſting diſpoſal were but an employment of an hours diſpatch, will not vouchſafe ſo fruitleſsly to caſt away any part of the time, when their ſouls are vigorous and healthful, about ſuch a trifling deſign, but deſtine their laſt few hours, when they are unable for any buſineſs elſe, to ſettle for themſelves an eſtate of eternity.

15. But becauſe I have not the leiſure now to proſecute this Argument as fully, as it may deſerve; Give me leave, I pray you, in brief, to preſent to your view, a man brought to ſuch an extremity as this; One faſtened

and chain'd unto the bed of ſickneſs, one that has already receiv'd within himſelf the meſſages of death, *Death beginning* (in the language of the Pſalmiſt) *to gnaw upon him.* Take the pains, I beſeech you, to imagine to your ſelves (and it will require ſome courage but to conſider it) what unquiet buſie thoughts ſhall then poſſeſs him, what terrible affrighting meditations ſhall then be ſuggeſted to him, when he ſhall be forc'd to apprehend, that now he has but a very ſmall portion of time left him; and yet for all that, all the buſineſs for the diſpatching of which he came into the world, is left undone; the counſel and good intention of God, out of which he gave him his Riches, being utterly defeated, ſcarce one friend made, that will vouchſafe to look upon him now in his neceſſity: but on the contrary, many ſore enemies procur'd, that will be ready to cry for vengeance againſt him: No account to be found of the diſpenſation of thoſe goods which God has given him, but ſuch a one as will ſerve to feed and nouriſh the diſtemper and ſickneſs of his thoughts: ſo much (may be) ſpent in the proſecution and fulfilling of his ungodly luſts, ſo much in gorgeous raiment and delicious feeding, yet all this while ſcarce one poor *Lazarus* obliged. Now all the remedy that is to be had in ſuch an exigence as this, is to have the next Preacher ſent for, who muſt inſtill a little comfortable Divinity into him, to make him ſleep, and ſo his ſoul departs the Lord knows whither. And yet theſe are but the beginnings of ſorrows, but what the end and perfection of them will be, I confeſs I have not the courage to tell you.

Obj. 1. 16. But yet for all this, I know men are apt ſo much to favour themſelves in their ſecurity, they will be ready to produce that famous example of the Thief on the Croſs to confute me, and to teſtifie, that even he that ſhall at the laſt puſh, as it were, have recourſe unto Gods mercy, is not altogether hopeleſs. Beſides, Did not he which came the laſt hour of the day to labour in the vineyard, receive the ſame wages with them who had ſuffered the toyle and heat of the whole day? For the Thief on the Croſs, there can lie no exception againſt the example. But yet conſider, I pray you, that from the beginning of the world, till the time that the Scripture-Canon was ſeal'd up, there is not to be found one example more to equal it Beſides, it was done at the time of Chriſts ſuffering; a ſeaſon wherein God in that one Act of the Redemption of the world, by the death of his Son, expreſs'd the very utmoſt of his mercy, and diſcover'd unto the world, as it were, in one entire ſum, all the riches and treaſures of his goodneſs. If therefore at ſuch a time, he was pleas'd to work a Miracle of mercy upon one, who probably having ſpent his whole life in ungodly forbidden courſes, had not, till then, light upon any extraordinary opportunities and means, able to break in pieces, and melt his flinty obdurate heart; Can this example then be any advantage to you, who every day, almoſt, have more then ſufficient means and offers of Grace, and are continually threatned with the danger of deferring your repentance, and of prolonging the time of making up your accounts; ſince you neither do, nor muſt, know the day nor hour, when God will expect them at your hands?

2. 17. As concerning the man which was call'd the laſt hour of the day to labour in the vineyard: I pray you take notice, that this man was a labourer, and though he took pains but for a ſhort time, yet labour he did: whereas,

Sol. 1.

whereas, he that ſhall defer his repentance and amendment of life, till his laſt hour, if he indeed prove ſorry for his ſins, yet labour he cannot; the beſt that he can do, is to make offers and reſolutions to work the good work of God, if it ſhall pleaſe him to ſpare him life: But that thoſe reſolutions of his ſhall be accepted with God, in ſtead of real very labour indeed, I find no commiſſion to aſſure you. But I confeſs, it is ſomething unſeaſonably done of me, to ſtand, ſo long at leaſt, upon ſuch ſullen melancholick meditations, as thoſe are; eſpecially now in the midſt of this ſolemn glorious Feaſt: Therefore I am reſolved even abruptly to break through them, and to haſten to my ſecond General, which is the Counſel which our Saviour gives us upon this conſideration, that neceſſarily we muſt fail, namely, to provide, and ſeriouſly project againſt that time, by all the means we can make, to oblige to our ſelves friends in that extremity; expreſſed in theſe words, *Make to your ſelves friends of the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs.*

18. *Mammon of unrighteouſneſs?* What is that? Shall I deal freely and honeſtly with you? Indeed I will: (for, woe unto me, if I ſhould dare to come into this place to flatter you: and woe unto me, if I ſhould dare to come into this place to vent my ſpleen againſt any). Then all this, for which there is ſuch a doe kept, not only here, but all the world over; ſuch making of friends, nay, ſuch undermining of friends; ſo many dangers ſought out and deſpis'd: This is the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs. An untoward name, I confeſs, for a thing ſo much ſet by, ſo carefully and ambitiouſly courted, ſo inſatiably thirſted after. But yet a name of Chriſts deviſing, He has afforded this Idol, Riches, no better a title; and therefore I muſt, and dare call them ſo, any where. *Part. II.*

19. But may it not be lawful to enquire after; or, give ſome gueſſes, at leaſt, at the Reaſons which might move our Saviour to put ſo diſgracefull a name upon Riches? Without queſtion, it is not only lawful to be ſo curious, but alſo very uſeful and expedient. A main Reaſon (I have heard) is, becauſe ordinarily, Riches leave a tincture and infection in the perſons who have any thing to do with them. It is a hard thing, almoſt impoſſible, for a man any waies to meddle with them without ſin: ordinarily, they are got with ſin, they are poſſeſſed with ſin, they are ſpent with ſin. A man (ſaith *Siracides*) cannot haſten to be rich without ſin: and when he has once got them, how unwilling will he be to let a luſt paſs unſatisfied, ſeeing he is furniſh'd with that, to which (in his opinion at leaſt) nothing can be deny'd! How unwilling will he be to be worſted, though in the moſt unjuſt cauſe, ſeeing he is furniſh'd with that which will blind the eyes of the prudent, and pervert the underſtanding of the wiſe! For (ſaith the ſame wiſe man) *as a mans Riches, ſo his anger encreaſeth.* And upon the ſame grounds, it may be ſaid, that, As a mans Riches encreaſe, ſo likewiſe his Deſires and Luſts encreaſe. I will undertake to give you one Reaſon more, why Riches are called Mammon of unrighteouſneſs; and it is, becauſe they are Mammon, Riches indeed, only to unrighteous men; none beſide ſuch, will reſt contented with them, and ſuffer God to depart from him without a greater bleſſing than they can be.

20. But what need I trouble my ſelf about enquiring after reaſons, why this ſo univerſally-adored Idol, Mammon, is ſo diſhonourably branded

and ſtigmatized by our Saviour, ſince himſelf in another place has ſaid enough of it; which may ſuffice, not only to warrant the reaſonableneſs of this title; but alſo to make them, who are apt to glory ſo much in riches, if they well conſider it, even to envie the happineſs and ſecurity of thoſe who are not truſted with ſo dangerous wares. The words were ſpoken upon occaſion of a ſudden great ſorrow, and melancholy which appeared in a young mans countenance, and procur'd by the temptations of Riches, which made him refuſe the moſt advantageous Bargain that ever was offered to man. Whereupon, ſaith Chriſt to his Diſciples (as his words are recorded by S. *Matthew*) *Verily, I ſay unto you, that a Rich man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. And again I ſay unto you, that it is eaſier for a Camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Indeed S. *Mark* reports this ſpeech ſomething more largely than it is there, and inſtead of *a Rich man*, puts in, *One that truſteth in his Riches:* Which he does not ſo much to explain the phraſe of the ſpeech, as to give a reaſon of the Impoſſibility.

Mat. 19. 23, 24.

Mark 10. 24.

21. For, if our Saviour (in ſaying, *It is impoſſible for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*) by a rich man, had meant one that truſteth in his Riches, there had been no ſufficient ground for ſo great an amazement as ſeiz'd upon the Diſciples at the hearing of it; For that was a thing which they knew well enough before; not the moſt ignorant of his hearers, but could have told him as much. Therefore S. *Matthew*'s and S. *Mark*'s words joyn'd together, will make up this ſenſe (which I make no queſtion at all, but that it was Chriſts meaning) namely, that it is even almoſt impoſſible for a Rich man to be ſav'd, becauſe he cannot chuſe but truſt in his Riches.

22. And this is more clearly evinced by that ſatisfaction which our Saviour gave to his Diſciples to recover them from their aſtoniſhment; where he ſayes, *With men it is impoſſible, but not with God; for with God all things are poſſible:* Intimating thus much; That conſidering the great, almoſt irreſiſtable, Temptations which Riches carry along with them, and mans extream weakneſs and natural impotency; his willing propenſion, and to all ordinary natural means, moſt incurable inclination to make them his place of reſt, his ſtrong city wherein he truſts: It is impoſſible, that theſe things meeting together, he ſhould not put his confidence in them, and ſo make himſelf incapable of Heaven, between which and Riches thus uſed, there is a large, as unpaſſable a gulf as between Heaven and Hell: *With men* therefore *theſe things are impoſſible, but not with God; for with him all things are poſſible.* It is in his power, by the help and aſſiſtance of that grace which he ſhowres upon every one of us in Baptiſm, to cure this hereditary weakneſs and ſickneſs of our natures, and to render us healthful and vigorous, powerful enough to free our ſelves from that bondage and ſlavery, wherein theſe outward worldly bleſſings are apt to captive us, and whereunto by nature we do willingly ſubmit our ſelves. It is in his power to make thoſe pernicious pleaſures, which Riches may promiſe unto us, to become unwelcome and diſtaſteful unto us; Nay, which is more, it is in his power to make even this Mammon of unrighteouſneſs againſt its own nature, to become an help and inſtrument to procure for us the true Riches, even thoſe unvaluable treaſures which

God

God hath laid up in heaven for us. Take it not ill therefore, I beſeech you, if that, for which you are ſo much envy'd and reverenc'd above other men, be ſo undervalued by our Saviour in compariſon with the true Riches; be not angry with our Saviour for it: But rather endeavour, by trading providently with them, for your own and others benefit, to render Chriſt's language in this place improper and abuſive.

23. But now if Riches deſerve no better a title at our Saviour's hands, how can it be likely that they can prove fit inſtruments to procure friends, and ſuch friends as we ſtand in need of? *For, do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thiſtles?* Indeed the argument held well on S. *Paul's* ſide, when he ſayes, *If we have ſowed to you ſpiritual things, is it much if we reap your temporal things?* But will the argument hold alſo on Chriſts part; If ye have not been faithful in the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs, who will truſt you with the true Riches? Certainly, if it does not, not only this, but divers Chapters beſides, might, without any loſs, have been left out of the Goſpel.

24. And therefore it was a ſullen ill-natured fellow (he in the Parable, I mean, which received the one talent) and without all queſtion, a ſhameleſs lyar (though I fear, there be many, who are not very averſe from his opinion) who with an impudent face durſt tell God, *He was auſtere, reaping where he had not ſown, and gathering where he had not ſcattered.* And though he ſpake this with the ſame confidence that his Proſelytes do in theſe our daies, not as a probable opinion, but as a thing that he is aſſured of; (for, ſayes he, *I know thee, that thou art auſtere*, &c.) Yet I beſeech you believe him not: No, no, Our God is a gracious God, and requires of us no more than we are able to do. He does not expect Faith, and Repentance, and Good Works, where he has given no abilities to perform them: Nay, doth not God by his Prophet tell us, and Chriſt repeats it in his Parable, that he is ſo far from that, that after ſeveral years labour beſtowed on his vineyard, and yet no fruit iſſuing; yet he was content to expect one year longer, even till he had done ſo much, that no more could be done; he is at a ſtay, and asks, What he could have done more?

25. It were therefore very fit and convenient, that we ſhould, at leaſt in our own hearts, ſilence and ſtifle ſuch opinions concerning God as theſe are. And believe, that he is a well-wiſher to us, when he beſtows any means upon us, whereby we may do good. Otherwiſe, we ſhall without any comfort or courage, heartleſly, and even ſleepily go about the performing of what Chriſt here counſels us to. If you will not believe me upon my word, take the mans own confeſſion: ſayes he, When I had once entertain'd this perſwaſion, that God would expect a more yielding plentiful harveſt, fruitful beyond that proportion of ſeed which he gave me to ſow, *I was affraid*: Horrour and uncomfortable thoughts ſeiz'd upon me, and I went and hid my talent in a Napkin, I e'en ſate ſtill, reſolv'd to put all to an adventure, and to expect what God would do with me; for, alas, how bootleſs, and to no purpoſe, would my weak endeavours be to procure the favour of ſuch a God, that would not be content but with a great deal more than lay in my power to perform.

26. 'Tis true indeed, Christ told him, that though he had had such an unworthy prejudicial conceipt of him, yet that even from thence he might have been mov'd to have made the best and most advantageous use of that Talent, which God had bestow'd on him; for sayes Christ, *If thou knewest I was austere, why didst thou not therefore put my money into the exchangers hands, and trade with it, that I might have receiv'd mine own with increase:* Why didst thou not at the least do thy best, to give satisfaction to thy hard austere master? God forbid, that I should doubt but that there are thousands, who, though it may be, have entertain'd this mans opinion and conceipt of God; yet make better use of it than he did. But yet the mans own confession, shews what ordinarily and naturally is the fruit and issue of it.

27. That therefore, which God sowes among you, is Riches; but yet, Riches, most improperly so called; that which he scatters and strews abroad, is the Mammon of unrighteousness: *Now, he which soweth* (saith the Apostle) *soweth in hope*, and he which scattereth, scattereth in hope. But what gain or interest, what a kind of harvest does God hope for after this his Seeds-time? why just such another as the same Apostle speaks of (*1 Cor.* 15.) where he discourses upon the Resurrection and glorious change of these our bodies; *They are sowen*, saith he, *in corruption, but are raised in incorruption; they are sowen in dishonour, but are raised in glory; they are sowen in weakness, but are raised in power; they are sowen natural bodies, but are raised spiritual heavenly bodies.* In like manner, God sowes among you those Riches, which himself, most disgracefully calls *the Mammon of unrighteousness*, in hope that he may reap the true Riches. He scatters among you such small trifles, that many even Heathen-men have been content to want, for the empty aerial reward of fame: nay, that some of them have been content to cast away in an humour: and these small things he scatters abroad, in hope that he may gather (what, think you?) the everlasting salvation of your souls and bodies. And is this that harsh austere Master?

1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44.

28. Indeed, if God were such a person as some men have given him out for; if he should scatter abroad his Riches as snares, on purpose to fetter and entangle men with them. If he should bestow upon any this Mammon of unrighteousness, with an intent, and resolution, that it should become unto them the Mammon of unrighteousness indeed, that it should make them indispos'd and uncapable of attaining unto the true riches; there might be some plea for them to fasten so injurious an accusation upon God. But can the Judge of all the earth deal so with his servants? Can he which is Goodness and Mercy it self, He who rejoyces to stile himself, The Preserver of men; Can he be so cruelly bountiful to his creatures, as by heaping upon them, the vanishing, unsatisfying, blessings of this life, thereby to fat and cherish them against the day of slaughter and destruction? God forbid!

29. I confess, notwithstanding that, such persons there may be upon whom God may in his wrath showr down Blessings, and Riches in his fierce displeasure: But they are only such, as by living in a continual habitual practise of undervaluing and contemning the daily offers of Grace and favour, have already condemn'd themselves, and seal'd themselves unto the day of destruction; and such an one was *Pharaoh*: concerning whom,

God

God himself testifies, saying, *For this reason I have raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my Name might be declared throughout all the Earth*, that is, Since by thy continual Rebellions thou hast judged thy self unworthy of life, for this reason I have raised thee up, I have kept thee alive, and preserv'd thee that none of my former plagues should sweep thee away, that at last, by an utter destruction of thee, together with the whole strength and flower of thy Kingdom, I may be glorified throughout the whole world. But I will leave discourfing and come nearer unto you, in the serious application of Christs counsel here. Exod. 9. 16.

30. It is the property of *Riches* (saith the Wise-man) *to gather many friends*: Those who are above others in wealth and power shall presently be furnish'd with friends more then they can well know what to do withall; But such friends are not concern'd at all in our Saviour's advice in my Text; The friends here intended are such, who are not here to restore again unto you in the same coin that they received: Give not to the Rich (saith our Saviour) for fear they repay you. Of all things in the world, take heed of being paid back again in this life, beware how you carry your reward along with you to your Grave. But leave it to be paid in exchange in another Countrey, where for using five Talents well, you shall have ten Cities given you. Where for the bounty of a Cup of cold water, you shall receive a Prophet's reward. Such a friend was offered once to the Rich-man in the Gospel, God sent him one to his dores, even to crave his friendship: But the Rich-man was so busied with the care of his Wardrobe and his Table, that he was not at leisure to hearken to so gainless an Offer: Notwithstanding the time came afterwards, when he miserably, to his cost, perceived what a blessed opportunity he had most negligently omitted, and even in Hell attempted to purchase his favour, and to obtain from his hand a poor Alms (God knows), but one drop of water; but all too late, the time of making friends was past, and a great unfordeable Gulf had divided them from all possible society and communion for ever. Prou. 19. 4.

31. Now consider (I beseech you) that it had been a very easie matter, for God so to have provided for all his creatures, that each particular, should have had enough of his own without being beholding to another for supply: But then two heavenly and divine Vertues had been quite lost; For, Where had been the Poor mans Patience, and the Rich mans Charity? The poor man, therefore wants that you may have occasion to exercise your liberality, and that by loosing and diminishing your wealth upon them, ye may become more full of Riches hereafter. So that, it is Gods great bounty to you, not only to give you plenty and abundance, but also to suffer others to languish in penury and want: It may be, God has suffered himself so long to be rob'd of his own Possessions his Tithes, that you might have the glory and comfort of restoring them: It may be, God has suffered the ancient superstitious Histrionical adorning of his Temples to be converted into the late slovenly prophaneness (commonly call'd worshipping in Spirit, but intended to be Worship without cost,) that you may find a happy occasion to restore those sacred places dedicated to his honour, to that Majesty and Reverence as may become Houses wherein God delights that his Name should dwell.

32. Now, if it be not in my power to perswade you, neither to make God nor man your debtors by your Riches: Yet I beseech you, make neither

neither of them your Enemies by them: Do not make your Riches Instruments of Warr to fight against God himself; for example, as maintaining an unjust cause by power, a cause which God abhorrs: Do not so requite God for his extraordinary liberality to you, as to make his Riches Instruments for the Devil to wreak his malice upon those whom God loveth: If I had not a care not to injure your patience too farr, what might not be said upon this subject? But, I perceive, it is fit for me to hasten to your release.

33. But before I quit my self, and ease you of further prosecution of this point, I shall desire you all to suffer one word of Exhortation, and if there be any here whom it may more neerly concern, I beseech them even by the bowels of Jesus Christ, that they will suffer too a word of most necessary reproof: And though what I shall say, doth not naturally flow from the words in hand, yet they bear a reasonable resemblance and proportion with them: So pertinent, I am sure, they are to the Auditory to whom I speak, that I would chuse rather quite to lose my Text, then here to leave them unsaid.

34. It is about making friends too: Indeed, not with the Mammon of unrighteousness: No, that is a trifle to it. It is about making friends with not revenging of injuries, with patient bearing and willing forgiving of offences: A duty so seriously, so incessantly, sometimes in plain words, sometimes in Parables, all manner of ways, upon all occasions, urg'd by our Saviour, that we cannot so much as pray, but we must be forc'd to acknowledg obedience to this Law, *Forgive us,--- As we forgive:* Yea, so boundlesly, and without all restrictions or reservations, is it enjoyn'd, That when as *Peter* thought it fair to have it limitted to a certain number, and proposed Seven, as, in his opinion, reasonable and convenient; No, saith our Saviour, Forgive not until seven times, but until four hundred fourscore and ten times: And if he could have imagined, that it were possible, for a man to have exceeded even this number also in injuries, without question, he would not have left there neither.

35. But, How is this Doctrin received in the world? What counsel would men, and those none of the worst sort give thee in such a case? How would the sobereſt, discreetest, well-bred Christian advise thee? Why thus, If thy Brother, or thy Neighbour, have offered thee an injury or an affront, forgive him? By no means: Thou art utterly undone, and lost in thy reputation with the world if thou dost forgive him: What is to be done then? Why, let not thy heart take rest, let all other business and imployment be laid aside till thou hast his bloud: How? a mans bloud for an injurious passionate speech, for a disdainful look? Nay, that is not all: That thou may'st gain amongst men the reputation of a discreet well-tempered Murderer, be sure thou killest him not in passion, when thy bloud is hot and boyling with the provocation; but proceed with as great temper and settledness of reason, with as much discretion and preparedness as thou wouldest to the Communion: After some several days respite, that it may appear it is thy Reason guides thee, and not thy Passion: Invite him mildly and courteously into some retired place, and there let it be determined; whether his bloud or thine shall satisfie the injury.

36. Oh

36. Oh thou Holy Christian Religion! Whence is it that thy children have suck'd this inhumane poysonous bloud, these raging fiery Spirits? For if we shall enquire of the Heathen, they will say, They have not learned this from us; or the Mahumetan, they will answer, We are not guilty of it: Blessed God! that it should become a most sure setled course for a man to run into danger and disgrace with the world, if he shall dare to perform a Commandement of Christ, (which is as necessary for him to do, if he have any hopes of attaining Heaven, as meat and drink is for the maintaining of life!) That ever it should enter into Christian hearts to walk so curiously and exactly contrary unto the ways of God! That whereas He sees himself every day and hour almost contemn'd and despis'd by thee who art his Servant, his creature, upon whom he might without all possible imputation of unrighteousness pour down all the Vials of his wrath and indignation, yet He notwithstanding is patient and long-suffering toward thee, hoping that his long-suffering may lead thee to repentance, and beseeching thee daily by his Ministers to be reconcil'd unto him: And yet thou on the other-side for a distemper'd passionate speech, or less, shouldst take upon thee to send thy neighbours soul, or thine own, or likely both, clogg'd and oppress'd with all your sins unrepented of, (for how can repentance possibly consist with such a resolution?) before the Tribunal seat of God to expect your final sentence: utterly depriving thy self of all the blessed means which God has contrived for thy Salvation, and putting thy self in such an estate, that it shall not be in Gods power almost to do thee any good. Pardon, I beseech you, my earnestness, almost intemperateness, seeing it hath proceeded from so just, so warrantable a ground; And since it is in your power to give rules of honour and reputation to the whole Kingdom, do not you teach others to be ashamed of this inseparable Badg of your Religion, Charity and forgiving of offences; give men leave to be Christians without danger or dishonour; Or, if Religion will not work with you, yet let the Laws of that State wherein you live, the earnest desires and care of your Righteous Prince, prevail with you: But I have done, and proceed to my last part, which is the convenience and gain which shall accrew unto us by friends oblig'd with this Mammon of unrighteousness, Namely, *by them to be reciv'd into everlasting habitations.*

Part. III.

37. I must here again propose another question, but when I have done that, I must be forced to leave it without an answer, unless you will be content to take a conjecture, a probability, for an answer: It is, How, or after what manner those to whom we have done good here, shall hereafter receive us into everlasting habitations? Whether this is perform'd only by their Prayers and Intercession with God in the behalf of their Benefactors; Or, whether they are us'd as Instruments and conductors, as it were, as our Saviour may probably seem to intimate in the Parable where the Lord speaks to his Servants, *That they should take away the one Talent from him which had no more, and bestow it on him which had ten Talents.* So uncertain it is, whether this task shall be performed by them one of these ways, or by some other unknown course, that St. *Auguſtine* ingenuously confesses, he knows not what to make of it: Yet Cardinal *Bellarmine* says, he can easily assoil it,

it, and can in these words find out Purgatory, and satisfaction for sin after death, and a great deal more then I can understand: But truly, if he be able to spy Purgatory in this Text, especially such a one as he fancies to himself in his Books of that Argument, he has made use of better glasses than ever *Galileo* found out. And I would to God, those of his Party would consider how much the weakness of their cause is argued even from hence, that they are forc'd to ground most of the Points controverted between us upon such difficult places as these, of so ambiguous and uncertain meanings, and therefore equally obnoxious to any mans Interpretation. There may yet be found out a convenient sense of this place, especially, if we will allow an Hebraism in those words (which is frequent enough in the Evangelical writings) of putting the third person plural to express a passive sense, and then the meaning will be, *That when*, &c. *they may receive you*, *i. e.* That ye may be receiv'd *into everlasting habitations:* Parallel to a like phrase in Luk. 12. 12. *Thou Fool, this night shall they take away thy soul from thee*, *i. e.* Thy soul shall be taken from thee. And, if this sense be true, as it is very likely, many of our Romish Adversaries have spent much pains about this Text to no purpose.

38. But to leave quarrelling: It is no very considerable matter: whether we have light upon the true sense of those words, or no, or whether those, to whom we have done good, have a share in purchasing for us an admission into these everlasting habitations, as long as we may infallibly hence conclude, that though it should fall out, that *Abraham* should forget us, and *Israel* become ignorant of us; yet certainly, God, (who alone, is instead of ten thousand such friends) he will keep a Register of all our good actions, and will take particular care of us, to give us a just proportion of reward and harvest of glory according to our sparingness, or liberality in sowing.

Obj. 39. But, Would Almighty God have us such mercenary Servants, so careful and projecting for our own advantage, that we should not obey him without a compact and bargain? Is not He worthy the serving, unless we first make our condition with him, to be sure to gain and thrive by him? Is this a consideration worthy and befitting the ingenuity and nobleness of a Christian mind, *to have an eye unto the recompence of reward?* Is Christ also become a School-master unto us, as well as the Law was to the Jews, that we should have need of Thunder and Blackness of smoke, and Voyces to affright us, or Promises to win and allure us? Nay, Have not your ears oftentimes heard, from such places as this, an Obedience of this nature disgrac'd and branded for a Servile slavish obedience; an obedience ordinarily made the mark and badg even of a formal Hypocrite, the worst kind of Reprobates?

Sol. 40. I confess, I could shew you a more excellent way then this, if men were ordinarily fitted and qualified for the receiving of it: And that is St. *Pauls* more excellent way of Charity: the keeping of God's Commandements meerly out of the love of his goodness and consideration of his infinite inconceivable holiness: *And he that can receive this, let him receive it*, and thrice happy and blessed shall he be of the Lord: But in the mean time, let him not be forward to judg his fellow-servants, if they acknowledg themselves so farr guilty of weakness and imperfections, that they have need

need to receive ſtrength and encouragement in this their painful and laborious race, *by looking forward unto the glorious prize of their high calling in Jeſus Chriſt.*

41. Surely God is wiſe enough to contrive the ſureſt courſe, and to ſet down the beſt and likelyeſt means for perſwading us to his ſervice, and the obedience of his Commandements: He is able to enquire and ſearch into the moſt retired corners of our wicked, deceitful hearts, and thereby knowing our temper and diſpoſition, he is able beſt to preſcribe us a method and diet ſuitable to our conſtitutions. Therefore, if he out of his infinite wiſdom, and the conſideration of what encouragements we ſtand in need of, hath thought it fit to annex to every Precept almoſt, a promiſe of happineſs, or a threatning of unavoidable danger to the tranſgreſſours; What art thou, O man, that thou dareſt take upon thee to calumniate his proceedings, and to preſcribe better directions than he has thought fit!

42. I beſeech you therefore, (my beloved Brethren,) by all means make uſe of any advantages, which may ſerve to render you more earneſt, more eager and reſolute in your obedience to thoſe holy and perfect Commandements which he hath enjoyn'd you: If you cannot find your ſelves arriv'd as yet to that height of perfection, as that Love and Charity cannot wreſt from you ſufficient careſulneſs to obey him; Let fear have its operation with you, fear and horrour of that terrible iſſue which ſhall attend the wilful and habitual tranſgreſſours of his Laws: And you need not ſuſpect this courſe as unwarrantable, for you ſhall have St. *Paul* for your example, even that *Paul* for whoſe miraculous converſion, Chriſt was pleas'd himſelf in Perſon to deſcend from his Throne of Majeſty: that *Paul* who laboured in the Goſpe more than all the reſt of the Apoſtles: that *Paul*, whoſe joy and hearts comfort it was to be afflicted for the Name of Chriſt: Laſtly, that *Paul*, who for a time, was raviſh'd from the Earth to the third Heaven after a moſt inexpreſsable manner, and there heard things that cannot be uttered; This *Paul*, I ſay, ſhall be your example, who after all theſe things, found it yet a convenient motive, and received great encouragement and eagerneſs to proceed in his moſt bleſſed converſation, even from this fear, *Leſt, whileſt he preached to others, himſelf ſhould become a caſt-away.*

43. And when Fear has done its part, let Hope come in; Hope of that happy Communion, which you ſhall once again have with thoſe friends which may be purchaſed in this life at ſo eaſie a rate; Hope of that eternal weight and burden of joy and glory, which is reſerved in Heaven for you if you hold faſt *the rejoycing of the Hope ſtedfaſt unto the end:* Let a comfortable meditation of theſe things encourage and hearten you to proceed from one degree of holineſs to another, till *we all come in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledg of the Son of God to a perfect Man, to the meaſure of the fulneſs of the ſtature of Chriſt:* And for an example in this, take that whole cloud of witneſſes muſtered together (in *Heb.* 11.) Or, if they will not ſerve the turn, take an Example above all examples, an Example, beyond all imaginable exceptions, even our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, concerning whom the Author of the ſame Epiſtle (it was St. *Paul*, ſure,) ſaith Chap. 12. That *for the joy which was ſet before him, deſpiſed the ſhame, and endured the Croſs*, &c. Heb. 3. 6.

44. God knows, we have need of all manner of encouragements, and all little enough for us, ſo ſluggiſh and immoveable, ſo perverſe and obſtinate

ſtinate are we: Therefore for Gods ſake, upon any terms, continue in the ſervice of Chriſt, make uſe of all manner of advantages, and though ye find hope, or fear, predominate in you, (theſe ſervile affections, as they are commonly call'd) yet for all that, faint not, diſpair not, but rather give thanks to Almighty God: and God who ſees ſuch good effect of his Promiſes and Threatnings in you, (of which all the Scripture is full from one end to the other) will in his good time fill your hearts full of his Love, even *that perfect love which caſteth out fear*, and of that perfect Love which ſhall have no need of Hope, He will perfect that his good work in you unto the end.

45. To conclude all: Whether ye ſhall perform this Commandement of Chriſt, or whether ye ſhall not perform it, It cannot be avoided, Everlaſting habitations ſhall be your reward: Only the difference is, Whether ye will have them of your Enemies providing, whether ye will be beholding to the Devil and his Angels, your ancient mortal Enemies to prepare everlaſting dwellings for you; *And who can dwell in everlaſting fire*, (ſaith the Prophet), *Who can dwell in continual burnings?* Or, whether ye will expect them from the aſſiſtance of thoſe juſt perſons, whom you have by your good works eternally oblig'd to you, even thoſe bleſſed and glorious Habitations, which God the Father Almighty hath from the beginning of the world provided and furniſh'd for you; which God the Son by his meritorious Death and Paſſion hath purchaſed for you; and for the admiſſion whereunto, God the Holy Ghoſt hath ſanctified, and adorn'd you, that in thankfulneſs and gratitude you your ſelves may become everlaſting Habitations, pure and undefiled Temples for him to dwell in for ever and ever. Now unto theſe glorious and everlaſting habitations, God of his infinite mercy bring us, even for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake: To whom, with the Father, *&c.*

The

The Seventh Sermon.

Luke XIX. 8.

—— *And if I have defrauded any man by forged cavillation, I reſtore unto him four fold.*

The Son of man (ſaith our Saviour of Himſelf in the end of this ſtory) *is come to ſeek and to ſave that which was loſt.* Verſ. 10. And how careful and ſolicitous he was in the diſcharge of this employment and buſineſs about which his Father ſent him; this ſtory of *Zacchæus* (out of which my Text is taken) will evidently and lively diſcover. For here we have a Man, that among ten thouſand one would think were the moſt unlikely to become a Diſciple of Chriſts, ſo indiſpos'd he was for ſuch a change, ſo unqualified in all reſpects. For firſt, he was Rich, as the third verſe tells us; and if that were all his fault, yet in our Saviour's judgement, which was never uncharitable, being ſo clogg'd and burdened with theſe *impedimenta* (as even the Heathens could call Riches) it would be as hard for him to preſs through and enter in at the ſtreight gate, without uneaſing and freeing himſelf from them, as for a Camel to go through the eye of a Needle.

2. But ſecondly, theſe his Riches, as it would ſeem, were ſcarce well and honeſtly gotten. For his trade and courſe of life, was a dangerous trade, obnoxious to great, almoſt irreſiſtible, temptations: A great meaſure of grace, would be requiſite to preſerve a man incorrupt and undefiled in that courſe: and ſo ill a name he had gotten himſelf, that all that afterwards ſaw Chriſts familiarity with him, were much offended, and ſcandaliz'd at it; for we read in the 7. verſe, *that when they all ſaw it, they murmured, ſaying, that he was gone in to lodge with a ſinful man*; Verſ. 7. with one famous and notorious for a great oppreſſour.

3. Yet notwithſtanding all this, ſuch was the unſpeakable mercy and goodneſs of Chriſt, that even of this Stone, ſo ſcorned and rejected of all the people, *he raiſed a ſon unto Abraham*, as we find in the 9. verſe. Verſ. 9. And to bring this to paſs, he took occaſion even from a vain curioſity

of this *Zacchæus*, an humour of his, it may be ſuch a one as afterward poſſeſſed *Herod* (though God knows he had not the ſame ſucceſs) namely, to ſee ſome ſtrange work performed by Chriſt, of whom he had heard ſo much talk. This opportunity, I ſay, our Saviour took to perform an admirable miracle, even upon the man himſelf; and that he brought about by as unlikely a courſe, only with inviting himſelf to his houſe: By which unexpected affability and courteſie of our Saviour, this ſo notorious and famous Publican and ſinner, was ſo ſurpriz'd with joy and comfort, that preſently he gives over all thought and conſideration of his trade, as a thing of no moment; and being to receive Chriſt into his houſe, and knowing how ill agreeing companions Chriſt and Mammon would prove in the ſame lodging; he reſolves to ſweep it and make it clean, for the entertaining of him; he empties it of that droſs and dung wherewith before it was defiled; half of his eſtate goes away at a clap upon the poor, and the remainder, in all likelihood, is in great danger to be conſum'd by that noble and generous offer which he makes in the words of my Text: *Whomſoever I have defrauded by forged cavillation, I reſtore*, &c.

Diviſion. 4. In which words I ſhall obſerve unto you theſe two General Parts: 1. Firſt, a Diſcovery, and, it may be, confeſſion of his beloved boſome ſin, the ſin of his trade, in theſe words: *If I have defrauded any man*, or 2. *whomſoever I have defrauded.* Secondly, Satisfaction tendered in the words following: *I reſtore unto him four fold.* In the former General, we may take notice of two particulars: 1. *Zacchæus* his willingneſs and readineſs of his own accord to diſcover and confeſs his ſin, when he ſaid, *Whomſoever I have defrauded.* And, 2. the nature and heinouſneſs of the crime diſcovered, which is called a *defrauding by forged cavillation*; or, as ſome Tranſlations read, *with falſe accuſation.* In the ſecond General likewiſe (which is the ſatisfaction tendered by *Zacchæus*) there offer themſelves two particulars more, namely, 1. So much of the ſatisfaction as was neceſſary to be performed, by virtue of an indiſpenſable Precept, and that is Reſtitution in theſe words, *I reſtore unto him.* 2. That which was voluntary and extraordinary namely, the meaſure and exceſs of this Reſtitution, which he profeſſeth ſhould be *four fold.* Of theſe two parts therefore, with their ſeveral particulars in the ſame order as they have been propoſed, briefly, and with all the plainneſs and perſpicuity I can imagine: And, 1. Of the former General, and therein of the firſt Particular, namely, *Zacchæus* his readineſs to confeſs his Sin, in theſe words: *If I*, &c.

General. I. *Partic.* 1. 5. I ſaid even now only, It may be this was a confeſſion of his crime; but now I will be more reſolute, and tell you peremptorily, this was a confeſſion: for without all queſtion, *Zacchæus*, as the caſe ſtood now with him, was in no humour of Juſtifying himſelf, he had no mind to boaſt his integrity in his office: Or, if he had, he might be ſure that common fame (if that were all, yet that alone) might be a ſufficient argument, at leaſt too great a preſumption againſt him, to confute him. But to put it out of queſtion: Our Saviour himſelf, by applying the 10. verſe of this Chapter to him, acknowledgeth him for a ſinful undone man; one that had ſo far loſt himſelf in the wandring mazes of this wicked world, that unleſs Chriſt himſelf had taken the pains to ſearch and enquire

enquire after him, and having found him, by the power and might of his Grace to reſcue and recover him from the errour of his ways, by reſtoring him his eyes, whereby he might take notice towards what a dangerous precipice he was haſtening, there had been no poſſibility but at laſt he muſt have needs fallen headlong into the gulf of deſtruction.

6. Now it being, I ſuppoſe, evident, that *Zacchæus* was guilty, and that in a high degree, and openly and ſcandalouſly guilty of the crime here diſcover'd: there is no doubt to be made, but that he who was ſo willing to unlock and diſperſe his ill gotten treaſures, would not begin to divert his covetouſneſs upon his ſins, he would not hoard them up, but would place his glory even in his ſhame; and whereas he had been the ſervant and ſlave of ſins, he would wear his ſhackles and fetters, as ſigns of the glorious victory, which through Chriſt he had won, and emblemes of that bleſſed change which he found in himſelf, being reſcued from the baſeſt ſlavery that poſſibly can be imagined, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God.

7. But it may be, you will ſay, Suppoſe *Zacchæus* did freely and voluntarily confeſs his ſin to Chriſt, who had authority to forgive him his ſins, though he had never diſcovered them: what collection ſhall be made from hence? *Zacchæus* might be as bold as he would with himſelf; but as for us, his example ſhall be no rule to us; we thank God this is Popery in theſe daies, and ſince we have freed our ſelves from this burden, we will not be brought into bondage to any man; we will confeſs our ſins, I warrant you, only to God, who is only able to forgive us them; as for the Miniſter, it may be, we will ſometimes be beholding to him to ſpeak ſome comfortable words now and then to us, when we are troubled in conſcience, and we have not been taught to go any further.

8. I confeſs I find no great inclination in my ſelf, eſpecially being in the Pulpit, to undertake a controverſie, even where it may ſeem to offer it ſelf, much leſs to preſs and ſtrein a Text for it, for I deſire to have no adverſaries in my Preaching, but only the Devil and Sin. Only having now mentioned Confeſſion, and conſidering how much the Doctrine of our holy Mother the Church hath been traduc'd, not only by the malice and detraction of our profeſſed enemies of the Church of *Rome*, but alſo by the ſuſpicious ignorance and partiality of her own children; who out of a liking of the zeal, or rather fury, of ſome former Proteſtant Writers, have laid this for a ground of ſtating Controverſies of our Religion: That that is to be acknowledged for the Doctrine of theſe Reformed Churches, which is moſt oppoſite and contradicting to the Church of *Rome*. So that, as the caſe goes now, Controverſies of Religion are turn'd into private quarrels, and it is not ſo much the Truth that is ſought after, as the ſalving and curing the reputation of particular men.

9. Theſe things therefore conſidered, truly for my part, I dare not take upon me ſo much to gratifie the Papiſts, as to think my ſelf oblig'd to maintain many incommodious ſpeeches of ſome of our Divines in this point. *Hoc Ithacus velit & magno mercentur Atridæ* —— They will never be unfurniſh'd of matter to write Books to the worlds end,

if this ſhall be the method of ſtating Controverſies. Oh what an impregnable cauſe ſhould we have againſt the Church of *Rome*, if we our ſelves did not help to weaken and betray it, by mixing therewith the intereſts and conceits of particular men.

10. Give me therefore leave, I pray you, to give you the ſtate of the Queſtion, and the Doctrine of our Church, in the words of one who both now is, and for ever will worthily be accounted, The glory of this Kingdome. "Be it known (ſaith he) to our adverſaries of *Rome*, (I add alſo, to our adverſaries even of *Great Britain*, who ſell their private fancies for the Doctrine of our Church) that no kind of Confeſ- "ſion, either publick or private, is diſallow'd by our Church, that is "any way requiſite for the due execution of that ancient *Power of the* "*Keys*, which Chriſt beſtowed upon his Church. "The thing which "we reject, is that new pick-lock of Sacramental Confeſſion obtruded "upon mens conſciences, as a matter neceſſary to ſalvation, by the Ca- "nons of the late Conventicle of *Trent* in the 14. Seſſion.

Biſhop *Uſher's* Anſ. to the Jeſuit. Cap. of Confeſſion. p. 84.

11. And this truth being ſo evident in Scripture, and in the writings of the ancient beſt times of the Primitive Church, the ſafeſt interpreters of Scripture, I make no queſtion, but there will not be found one perſon amongſt you, who when he ſhall be in a calm unpartial diſpoſition, that will offer to deny: For, I beſeech you, give your ſelves leave unpartially to examine your own thoughts. Can any man be ſo unreaſonable as once to imagine with himſelf, that when our Saviour after his Reſurrection, having received (as himſelf ſaith) all power in heaven and earth, having led captivity captive, came then to beſtow gifts upon men: when he, I ſay, in ſo ſolemn a manner (having firſt breath'd upon his Diſciples, thereby conveying and inſinuating the Holy Ghoſt into their hearts) renewed unto them, or rather confirm'd and ſeal'd unto them that glorious Commiſſion, which before he had given to *Peter*, ſuſtaining, as it were the perſon of the whole Church; whereby he delegated to them an authority of binding and looſing ſins upon earth, with a promiſe, that the proceedings in the Court of Heaven, ſhould be directed and regulated by theirs on Earth: Can any man, I ſay, think ſo unworthily of our Saviour, as to eſteem theſe words of his for no better than complement; for nothing but Court-holy-water?

12. Yet ſo impudent have our adverſaries of *Rome* been in their dealings with us, that they have dared to lay to our charge; as if we had ſo mean a conceit of our Saviour's gift of the Keys, taking advantage indeed from the unwary expreſſions of ſome particular Divines, who out of too forward a zeal againſt the Church of *Rome*, have bended the ſtaffe too much the contrary way; and in ſtead of taking away that intolerable burden of a Sacramental, neceſſary, univerſal Confeſſion, have ſeem'd to void and fruſtrate all uſe and exerciſe of the Keys.

13. Now, that I may apply ſomething of that, which hath now been ſpoken, to your hearts and conſciences. Matters ſtanding as you ſee they do; ſince Chriſt, for your benefit and comfort, hath given ſuch authority to his Miniſters upon your unfeigned repentance and contrition, to abſolve and releaſe you from your ſins: why ſhould I doubt, or be unwilling to exhort and perſwade you, to make your advantage of this gracious promiſe of our Saviours? why ſhould I envy you the participa-

tion

tion of ſo heavenly a Bleſſing? Truly, if I ſhould deal thus with you, I ſhould prove my ſelf a malicious, unchriſtian-like, malignant Preacher; I ſhould wickedly and unjuſtly, againſt my own conſcience, ſeek to defraud you of thoſe glorious Bleſſings, which our Saviour hath intended for you.

14. Therefore, in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoyned, by my holy Mother the Church of *England* expreſly, in the Book of Common-Prayer, in the Rubrick of Viſiting the Sick (which Doctrine this Church hath likewiſe embraced ſo far) I beſeech you, that by your practiſe and uſe, you will not ſuffer that Commiſſion, which Chriſt hath given to his Miniſters, to be a vain form of words, without any ſenſe under them, not to be an antiquated, exſpired Commiſſion, of no uſe nor validity in theſe daies: But whenſoever you find your ſelves charg'd and oppreſſed, eſpecially with ſuch Crimes as they call *Peccata vaſtantia conſcientiam*, ſuch as do lay waſte and depopulate the conſcience, that you would have recourſe to your ſpiritual Phyſician, and freely diſcloſe the nature and malignancy of your diſeaſe, that he may be able, as the cauſe ſhall require, to proportion a remedy either to ſearch it with corroſives, or comfort and temper it with oyl. And come not to him, only with ſuch a mind as you would go to a learned man experienc'd in the Scriptures, as one that can ſpeak comfortable quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God himſelf, to abſolve and acquit you of your ſins. If you ſhall do this, Aſſure your ſouls, that the underſtanding of man, is not able to conceive that tranſport and exceſs of joy and comfort which ſhall accrew to that mans heart, that is perſwaded, that he hath been made partaker of this Bleſſing, orderly and legally, according as our Saviour Chriſt hath preſcribed.

15. You ſee, I have dealt honeſtly and freely with you; it may be more freely than I ſhall be thanked for: But I ſhould have ſinn'd againſt my own ſoul, if I had done otherwiſe; I ſhould have conſpir'd with our adverſaries of *Rome* againſt our own Church, in affording them ſuch an advantage to blaſpheme our moſt holy and undefiled Religion. It becomes you now, though you will not be perſwaded to like of the practiſe of what, out of an honeſt heart, I have exhorted you to; yet for your own ſakes, not to make any uncharitable conſtruction of what hath been ſpoken. And here I will acquit you of this unwelcome ſubject, and from *Zacchæus* his confeſſion of his Sin, I proceed to my ſecond particular, namely, the nature and hainouſneſs of the crime confeſs'd, which is here call'd a *defrauding another by forged cavillation.*

16. The crime here confeſſed, is called in Greek, *Sycophancy*; for the words are, Εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα. For the underſtanding of which word in this place, we ſhall not need ſo much to be beholden to the Claſſical Greek Authors, as to the *Septuagint*, who are the beſt Interpreters of the Idiom of the Greek language in the Evangelical writings. Two Reaſons of the word Συκοφάντης are given, the one by *Iſter in Atticis*, the other by *Philomneſtus de Smynthiis Rhodiis*, both recorded by *Athenæus* in that treaſury of ancient learning, his *Deipnoſophiſts*, in the third Book: which becauſe they are of no great uſe for the interpretation of S. *Luke*, I willingly omit. *Partic.* II.

17. Now there are four ſeveral words in the Hebrew, which the Seventy Interpreters have rendred in the old Teſtament by the word, συκοφάντης, and the verbal thereof συκοφαντέω. One whereof ſignifies to abalienate or wreſt any thing from another by fraud and ſophiſtry, oppoſed to another word in the ſame language, which imports to rob by plain open force and violence, *Job.* 25. 9. *Pſal.* 119. 121. *Prov.* 28. 3. *Eccleſ.* 4. 1. as likewiſe in *Pſal.* 71. 4. *Prov.* 14. 33. A ſecond word ſignifies to deal captiouſly and fallaciouſly with another, *Levit.* 29. 11. A third implies, a puniſhment or Mulct, which (as the Latine word *multa* will bear it) is either inflicted on the body or the purſe. And the laſt ſignifies, to Circumvent, or rather indeed to roll himſelf upon another, *Gen.* 43. 18.

Job 25. 9.
Pſal. 119. 121.
Prov. 28. 3.
Eccleſ. 4. 1.
Pſal. 71. 4
Prov. 14. 33.
Levit. 29. 11.
Gen. 43. 18.

18. Out of all which expreſſions in the Hebrew compounded together, we may extract a full ſenſe of the Crime here confeſſed by *Zacchæus*, and rendred in the Greek Original by συκοφαντέω, (eſpecially if we have reſpect to *Zacchæus* his office and trade of life, which was to be a maſter of the Publicans in that part of the Countrey where he liv'd, *i.* one who had chief authority in receiving the rents and cuſtoms due from thence to the Empire): *Zacchæus* his crime therefore (as may likewiſe be collected from that counſel which S. *John* the Baptiſt gave to the Publicans who came to his Baptiſm; which was, *that they ſhould exact no more than was their due*): His crime, I ſay, was to wring and extort from his poor countrey-men, either by fraud and falſe ſuggeſtions, or by violence, more than was due from them to the Empire: to enrich his private coffers by the ſpoyls of the miſerable inhabitants; to roll himſelf upon them and overwhelm them, by exactions for his private benefit: for that end, pretending the rights and neceſſities of State, and thereto tentering and ſtreining to the uttermoſt, that power and authority wherewith he was inveſted from *Rome*.

19. Theſe kind of Officers, though they were of good reputation with the *Romans*, as we may collect out of ſeveral orations of *Cicero*, for by their place they had the priviledge to be reckoned amongſt the *Equites Romani*; yet in the Countreys wherein they liv'd, eſpecially in *Jewry*, a tenacious covetous nation, they were the moſt odious perſons upon the Earth: Inſomuch as the very name of a Publican was grown into a Proverb, expreſſing a perſon that deſerved at all mens hands infamy and hatred. This therefore was *Zacchæus* his crime, this is that which he calls by as odious a name, of Sycophancy. But to leave this general diſcourſe of the name (for in your behalfs, I am weary of an argument ſo uſeleſs to you) I will now try, what advantage every one of us may make from *Zacchæus* his behaviour this place.

20. You ſee here *Zacchæus* (though he was a man exalted above the ordinary rank of men, yet he) deals ſomething plainly and homely with himſelf, when he can afford himſelf no better a name than Sycophant: a title of ſo odious and hateful a ſignification, that the Devil himſelf has not got ſo diſgraceful a name as that: For he is call'd but Satan, or διάβολος, that is, as the Holy Ghoſt himſelf interprets it *an accuſer of the brethren*. And though even that be a ſufficient crime; yet it is counted a more plauſible generous ſin, out of hatred, and rancour, and ill-nature by falſe accuſations, to endeavour the ſubverſion of ones enemy, than by

by baſe delating and informing, only for the hope of a little gain to himſelf, to procure the overthrow of his neighbours eſtate and reputation; which is the condition of a Sycophant.

21. From hence then we may be taught how differently we ought to behave our ſelves in the diſcovery of our own, and other mens ſins. If our brother hath offended, we are to ſoften and qualifie his ſin, to think charitably of him notwithſtanding; and to frame to our ſelves excuſes, that the matter may not be ſo bad as is generally ſuppoſed; as likewiſe hope, that hereafter, by a reformed life, he may redeem and cancel his forepaſt tranſgreſſions. And ſo we ſee even *John Baptiſt* himſelf (though a man of no plauſible Court-like behaviour yet) giving his advice to theſe Publicans, he would only call that an exacting more than was due, which *Zacchæus* here in himſelf moſt boiſtrouſly terms Sycophancy. Whereas towards our ſelves, we muſt be tetrical and almoſt uncharitable; we muſt not *break our own heads with precious balm*, as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh, that is, by ſoftned oylely excuſes aggravate and aſſiſt our own diſeaſe.

22. Secondly conſider, that *Zacchæus* his Sin, which he deals ſo roughly and diſcourteouſly with all here, was his beloved boſome ſin, the ſin of his trade and courſe of life; a ſin, in whoſe company and ſociety, he had alwaies been brought up; his *Peccatum*, ευπεισατον (as S. *Paul* moſt elegantly calls it) *the ſin that doth ſo eaſily beſet him*, or rather, that doth ſo well and fitly encompaſs him, that doth ſo exactly ſuit with him. For ordinarily, every man hath ſome one particular ſin, that fits his humour better, and ſits cloſer to him, like a well made garment, than any other. (And I think this expreſſion renders S. *Paul's peccatum* ευπεισατον, reaſonably well.) Other ſins are either too ſtreight for him, and do continually vex and gird him, ſo that he can take but little comfort in them: And ſuch are ſins againſt a mans conſtitution and temper: as for example, One act of Adultery, though for the time pleaſant, would yet afterwards more torment and afflict a covetous mans conſcience, than the devouring, it may be, of a whole Countrey. Or elſe they hang looſe about him, ſo thas though they be eaſie and delightful ſometimes, yet to wear them continually, would prove tedious and irkſome. But his dearly reſpected ſin, is good company at all times for him; and, ſo he may have leave to enjoy but that, he cares not much what becomes of all the reſt. *Uſe* 2. Heb. 12. 1.

23. As for inſtance, that I may preſs a little nearer to your conſciences. Put the caſe there were any one in this company, a covetous oppreſſing perſon, ſuch a one as *Zacchæus*, I'le warrant, he would have been content, that I ſhould rather have taken any Text in the Bible than this: He would have been pleaſed, nay, even rejoyced, to hear me inveigh bitterly againſt any other ſin beſides: Yea, he would willingly, in his own thoughts have joyn'd with me againſt any man living; For thereby he would be apt to juſtifie himſelf in his own eyes, and to ſay in his thoughts, The Preacher indeed is very earneſt in Gods behalf againſt ſome body, but I thank God I am righteous all this while, I am not at all concern'd in it: Nay, it may be, he would have been content to have taken my part even againſt himſelf too, in any other ſin beſides this.

24. But

24. But now, that I begin to ſet my ſelf againſt his darling, only favourite ſin, the delight of his ſoul, and, as it were, the breath of his noſtrils, he will by no means endure it. What? (thinks he) is there not room enough in all the Old and New Teſtament for this Preacher to exſpatiate in; are there not a thouſand precepts, and almoſt as many ſtories in the Bible, and muſt he needs ſingle out this? Am I the only perſon that he muſt aim at? Or, if he would needs be medling with me, could he not ſpare me, at leaſt, in this one ſmall ſin? Let him do his worſt to the reſt of my ſins; let him draw bloud from me in any other place beſides this: but this is a very ſucking of my hearts bloud; it is a renting to my bowels. The Lord ſurely will be merciful to me in this ſin only; *Lo, is it not a little one, and my ſoul ſhall live* in pleaſure and happineſs. And ſuch thoughts as theſe would the laſcivious perſon have entertain'd, if I had light upon his Text; and ſo the reſt.

25. But as for our new convert *Zacchæus*, (and I beſeech you let him be herein your example) he deals not ſo mercifully, no not with his dearly lov'd ſin of Oppreſſion: No, he is ſo far from that, that as if, in all other reſpects, he had been the moſt innocent holy man alive; he cannot remember, that his conſcience is troubled with any ſin beſides: All his aim and ſpight is directed againſt this only ſin, which having rooted out of his heart, he ſuppoſes he ſhall then be worthy to entertain his new invited bleſſed Gueſt.

26. And to ſay the truth, if a heart once enlightned by grace, find ſo much courage, as to be able to prevail againſt his *peccatum* ἐυπερίστατον, it will be an eaſie ſecure skirmiſh and reſiſtance that all the reſt will afford him: Hereupon, ſaith our Saviour to the Phariſees who were covetous, *If you give your riches to the poor, all things ſhall become pure unto you:* As if he ſhould ſay, This ſin of covetouſneſs, is the main chain whereby the Devil holds you captive at his pleaſure; ſtrein and force your ſelves only to break this chain, and then you ſhall be free indeed in perfect liberty; all your other ſins will be only to you as the green withs were to *Samſon*, even as *threeds of tow that have ſmelled the fire.*

27. Pertinent to this may that ſaying of our Saviours be in the 13. of S. *John*'s Goſpel; where giving his Diſciples a bleſſed Example of humility, in vouchſafing to waſh their feet; when it came to S. *Peter*'s turn, he would by no means endure it. But after our Saviour had ſomewhat ſharply rebuk'd him; Well, ſaies he, ſince thou wilt deſcend ſo far, as to waſh me, *Lord, not my feet only, but my hands and my head:* Leave not the work unperfect, ſince thou wilt begin to cleanſe and ſanctifie me; perfect this thy good work unto the end. Our Saviour replies, *He that is waſhed, needeth not, ſave to waſh his feet, but is clean every whit.* As if he ſhould ſay, If thou wilt take ſo much care, as to cleanſe and purifie ſuch parts as by continual exerciſe and travel, are moſt ſubject to be defiled, it will be an eaſie matter to preſerve thy ſelf pure through all the reſt. Thus *Zacchæus* having ſearch'd out the head and fountain, whence all thoſe noyſome luſts which appeared in his life, did flow, he ſuppoſes he ſhall ſufficiently purifie the ſtreams thence iſſuing; if he can once cleanſe the ſpring. Which he proceeds to perform, in my ſecond General; which is the ſatisfaction by him tendred in lieu of his former oppreſſions, in theſe words, *I reſtore unto him four fold.* In the handling

Joh. 13. 9.

Verſ. 10.

handling of which, I will according to my promiſe begin with the firſt particular thereof, namely, ſo much of this ſatisfaction, as is neceſſary to be performed by vertue of an indiſpenſable precept, which is of Reſtitution, in theſe words, *I reſtore unto him.*

28. There is a Doctrine blown about and diſperſed by a ſort of Preachers in the Reformed Churches, and greedily imbraced by their followers and Proſelytes, becauſe they are perſwaded, that themſelves are the moſt intereſted in it; which teacheth, that, No man has any right or propriety in the goods and riches which he poſſeſſeth, unleſs he be one of Gods elect faithful ſervants. So that thoſe who are reſolv'd to account themſelves in this number, and to exclude from this ſociety, all others who ſuit not with their humours; ſuch, I ſay, are apt too forwardly to think all others no better than uſurpers of their patrimony and inheritance. The dangerous effects and conſequences of which Doctrine, (eſpecially where power has not been wanting to make the beſt uſe and advantage of it) was wofully diſcovered in thoſe tumults, which not very long ſince were raiſed in *Germany*, eſpecially in *Weſtphalia*, about the City of *Munſter*. *General* II. *Partic.* 1.

29. This Doctrine I ſuppoſe was borrowed eſpecially from the Jeſuites, who, upon the ſame grounds, have entituled their Catholick King to almoſt all the Weſtern parts of the world; whereby many millions of poor ſouls have been moſt unhumanely and barbarouſly maſſacred, to make way for the ſuppoſed right owners the *Spaniards*, as we find teſtifi'd with horrour and deteſtation, even by many ingenuous honeſt-hearted writers of their own Nation.

30. Neither the time nor my Text will allow me leiſure to ſtand long upon the confuting of this pernicious Doctrine, I will only oppoſe to it that ſaying of the Pſalmiſt, *The Earth is the Lords, but he hath given it to the children of men:* No man alive, hath any right in the goods of this world, but only by a gift from God: and by his gift, all the children of men, without exception, are inſtated in it; ſo that no pretence of Religion or Election can be ſufficient for any one to diſſeiſe another man, of what condition or quality ſoever he be, that is once legally poſſeſſed of them.

31. Therefore, whoſoever he be, that whether by fraud, or violence, or any other title, ſhall invade, or uſurp upon the rights of another, he does, as much as in him lies, without any warrant, nullifie the gift of God, and takes upon him to oppoſe and thwart his moſt wiſe providence; ſetting up himſelf as it were in Gods ſeat, and dethroning him, eſtabliſhing a new order of providence of his own. And thinkeſt thou that doeſt theſe things, that thou ſhalt eſcape the Judgement of God? Canſt thou imagine, that he will patiently endure to ſee his Judgements reverſed, or his Mercies evacuated by thee? That whereas he hath ſaid, *I will bleſs this man, and enlarge his bounds upon the Earth*; thou ſhouldeſt take upon thee to ſay on the other ſide, Let God deal as mercifully as he pleaſeth to this man; but I know what I am reſolved of, I am determin'd to cruſh and grind him to powder; I am reſolv'd that his children ſhall beg at my gates, and not be ſatisfied; they ſhall bow unto me, and not be regarded. What a wretched unworthy opinion muſt ſuch a one, of neceſſity, entertain of God?

32. And

32. And I beſeech you, do not think that this is only a Rhetorical forced ſtreining of a Point. The Holy Ghoſt will tell you as much in expreſs terms, *Prov* 14. 31. and again, *Prov.* 17. 5. *He that oppreſſeth the poor, reproacheth his Maker.* He ſets his mark and brand of infamy almoſt upon all Gods glorious Attributes; as if God had not power enough to maintain the poor-man againſt his Adverſary; as if he had not wiſely enough diſpenſed his bleſsings; as if he would not ſuffer God to extend his mercies but upon whom himſelf ſhall pleaſe; and ſo of the reſt.

Prov. 14. 31. & 17. 5.

33. But I will now, for your ſakes, tranſgreſs ſomething the limits of my Text, and whereas I ſhould only meddle with the unlawfulneſs of deteining Goods gotten by oppreſsion and ſycophancy, I will make the ſubject more General in this Propoſition, which I beſeech you heedfully to attend, and hereafter ſeriouſly to conſider of: This therefore I ſay and teſtifie, *That whoſoever he be, whoſe Conſcience ſhall convince him, that he hath gain'd any thing by an unlawful courſe, If he reſolve not to reſtore it, and dye in that reſolution, it is impoſsible he ſhould be ſaved.* For the confirming of which Propoſition, inſtead of many, almoſt infinite, unanſwerable reaſons, I will only make uſe of two, each of them drawn from the impoſsibility in ſuch a man of performing two duties, moſt neceſſarily required at every mans hands that profeſſeth Chriſtianity; the one whereof is, Prayer; the ſecond, Repentance.

Doct.

34. Concerning Prayer, I will demonſtrate, That he can neither ſeriouſly give God thanks for beſtowing upon him thoſe Riches which he calls Bleſſings; nor ſecondly, deſire Gods bleſſing upon thoſe Riches. For the firſt, Without queſtion, if ſuch a one ſhall dare to open his mouth to give God thanks for his Riches, it will prove to him a greater ſin than the unjuſt unlawful gathering of them, as the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *His very Prayers ſhall be turned into ſin*; For thereby he will entitle the juſt Righteous God unto his abominable ſin. Dares ſuch a man, with any confidence, give thanks to Almighty God for ſuffering him to be his Enemy in oppreſſing and perſecuting, it may be, Gods faithful beloved ſervants, for ſuffering him to be an inſtrument of the Devils? Therefore, if there be any ſuch that hear me this day, (yet I hope, nay, I am almoſt confident, there is not) but, and if there be, let me beſeech him, that of all things in the world, he will take heed of giving thanks, let him rather proceed on blindly in his ſin, and put out of his mind all thought and conſideration of God; for never any Heathen could offer him ſuch an indignity as this, no not *Epicurus* nor *Diagoras* himſelf.

35. In the ſecond place: How can ſuch a one deſire God to bleſs unto him, and encreaſe thoſe Riches ſo unjuſtly gotten? Will he ſay, Lord make it appear unto the world, by bleſſing me in theſe my ungodly courſes that thou likeſt well of them, and that thou haſt been of conſpiracy with me in all mine ungracious projects; ſo ſhall the godly quickly be rooted out of the earth, for every one will take advantage to wrong another; if thou wilt bleſs me, every one will be ready to tread in my ſteps. We ſee a man in ſuch a ſtate cannot ſeriouſly pray no kind of Prayer, unleſs he purpoſe to mock God to his face, ſo that he has defrauded himſelf of one neceſſary means of Salvation: But that which follows is of greater importance yet.

36. There

36. There is nothing wherein a man (that is resolv'd not to part with Goods unlawfully gathered) can deal with more despiteful petulancy and uncivility with God, then by offering to pretend to an unfeigned Repentance. It is much like the behaviour of *Charles* the fifth unto God, who caused publick Prayers and Processions to be made unto God for the delivery of the Pope in *Spain*, whom himself at the same time detein'd Prisoner in his own Castle St. *Angelo*, with a resolution that howsoever those Prayers wrought with God to pitty his Vicar, yet till he had concluded Conditions for his own advantage with him, he should never be released: Just such another Enterlude, and phantastical Pageant must this mans Repentance be.

37. He will say, perhaps: Lord, I confess, I cannot justifie those ways and courses whereby I procur'd my wealth; it may be, to make way for my excess and superfluity many a poor soul (yet richer in thy grace and favour than my self) has been forc'd almost to starve for penury and want, It may be, there are store of Orphans and Widows that are importunate upon thee for vengeance against my unchristian profession; and I acknowledg, that for my demerits I am liable to be forc'd to drink the very dregs of thy fierce wrath and indignation for ever. I will therefore rely and cast my self upon thy mercy and pitty, which yet, if I cannot purchase without the loss and restitution of my ill gotten wealth, I will rather adventure upon thy fury; And though I know it to be a fearful thing and insupportable misery to fall into thy hands, as into the hands of an Enemy and pursuer; yet upon no manner of conditions will I part with my Riches; No, not though I were now upon my death-bed, being out of all hopes of ever enjoying any comfort and pleasure my self from them, and within few hours expecting to be convey'd into my everlasting Prison: yet rather then my Son, or my Kinsman (who even after restitution made of what is unlawfully got, might perhaps have remaining to him sufficient to maintain him plentifully in this world) yet rather then he shall abate any thing of that vanity and superfluity which my excess of wealth will be able to bear, I will endanger the forfeiture of my inheritance in the Land of the living.

38. But it may be, you will say, That it is an impossible thing for any man that pretends to Christianity, to have such thoughts in him as these. I confess, it is a hard thing for a man to make such a formal distinct Discourse with himself as this was: But consider, whether such a mans thoughts (which at an exigence, like this, are confus'd and tumultuous) yet if they were reduc'd into order and method, consider, I say, whether they would not be digested into a sense and meaning equivalent unto that which before I express'd; So that God who knows the bent and inclination of his Heart (much better than himself) he will display and discover them distinctly and legibly before his eyes, and will proceed against him, as if he had behav'd himself towards him after such an unworthy, more then Atheistical, fashion. *Object.* 1. *Sol.*

39. But again, it is possible, I may be reply'd upon, and have the case put, that a man who hath unrighteously oppressed or defrauded his neighbour, has not means enough left to make satisfaction by restoring. And that is no extraordinary example, that Goods ill got should have by the Justice of God wings given them to fly away, and escape out of the hands *Object.* 2.

of

of the Purchasers: Shall such men, because they are not able to re store, be concluded in such a desperate estate as before I have mentioned? No, God forbid! If in such circumstances a man shall be unfeignedly sorry for his misdeeds, and withal resolve, if God shall hereafter bless him with
Sol. abilities, to make restitution, our merciful God will accept of that good inclination of his heart, as if he had perfectly satisfi'd and restor'd to each man his due: For without all question, God will never condemn any man because he is not rich.

Object. 3. 40. If it shall be again questioned, and the supposition made, that a man (for example, a Tradesman) cannot possibly call to remembrance each particular mans name whom he hath wrong'd, (as indeed, it is almost impossible he should) what advice shall he take in such a case? I answer, that
Sol. he must in this case consider, that by this sin, he hath not only wrong'd his Neighbour, but God also; therefore since he cannot find out the one, let him repay it to the other: Let him be so charitable, and do that kindness to God, as to bestow it in Alms upon his poor servants: Or, since God himself is grown so poor and needy, (especially in this Kingdom) that he hath not means enough to repair his own Houses, nor scarse to make them habitable, He may do well to rescue God's Churches from being habitations of Beasts, and stables for Cattel: Or lastly, which more concerns you, since God is here grown so much out of purse, that he has not means enough to pay his own Servants wages equal to the meanest of your houshold servants, let not them any longer be the mocking-stocks of those *Canaanites*, your Enemies, that so swarm in your Land; Here is a subject fit indeed for your Charity: and a miserable case it is, God knows, that they should be the persons, who of all conditions of men should stand in greatest need of your mercy and charity.

41. Oh! but will some man say: We have found now at what the Preacher aimeth: All this ado about Restitution is only to enrich the Clergy. If such thoughts and jealousies as these arise in your hearts, (as I know, by experience, it is no unlikely thing they should) Oh then, I beseech you, for the mercies of God, consider in what a miserable state the Church must needs be, when the most likely course to keep the Ministers of God from starving must be your sins: When those to whom you have committed your souls in trust, as they that must give God an account for them, shall through want and penury be rendred so heartless and low-spirited, that for fear of your anger, and danger of starving, they shall not dare to interrupt or hinder you, when you run head-long in the paths that lead you to destruction: When out of faint-heartedness they shall not dare to take notice, no, not of the most scandalous sins of their Patrons, but, which is worst, be the most forward officious Parasites to sooth them in their crimes, and cry Peace unto them, when God and their own Consciences tell them that they are utter strangers from it, and neither do, nor are ever likely to know the ways of Peace: Lastly, when these Messengers of God shall be the most ready to tell you, that those Possessions and Tithes which have been wrested out of Gods hands are none of Gods due, that they are none of the Churches Patrimony; that their right is nothing but your voluntary Alms and charitable Benevolence, and that they shall think themselves sufficiently and liberally dealt withal, if you shall account them worthy to be the companions of the basest & meanest of your servants.

I could

I could almoſt be ſilent in this cauſe, did not our Enemies in *Gath* know of it, and if it were not publiſh'd in the ſtreets of *Askalon*, inſomuch, that you have given cauſe to the Enemies of God to blaſpheme our glorious and undefiled Religion.

42. I will conclude this Doctrin of Reſtitution moſt neceſſary certainly to be proſecuted in theſe times, only with propoſing to your conſiderations two Motives, which in all reaſon ought to perſwade you to the practiſe of it: the one ſhall be, that you would do it for your own ſakes; the other, for your childrens ſake. For the former; though I could never be ſcanted of Arguments ſufficient to enforce it, though I ſhould make it the ſubject of my Sermons to my lives end, yet becauſe, I perceive, it is time for me to haſten to your releaſe, I will only deſire you to remember how much I have told you already, that this Doctrin concerns you, ſince it is impoſſible for any man while he is guilty of the breach of this duty, to put in practiſe even the moſt neceſſary and indiſpenſable Precepts of Chriſtian Religion.

43. But concerning the ſecond Motive, which I deſire ſhould induce to the practiſe of Reſtitution, namely, that you ſhould be perſwaded to it even for your childrens ſake, I beſeech you, take this ſeriouſly into your conſideration. That whereas, it may be, you may think that by heaping wealth, howſoever purchaſed, upon your heirs, you ſhall ſufficiently provide for them againſt all caſualties, yet, that God alſo hath his treaſures in ſtore to countervail yours, and to provide ſo, that your Heirs ſhall take but little content, God knows, in all their abundance: for, as it is in *Job.* 20. 8. *God will lay up the iniquity of ſinners for their children, i.e.* He will not ſatisfie himſelf with wreaking vengeance of other mens wrongs upon your heads that have done them, but will take care alſo, that your children ſhall be no gainers by the bargain: Therefore, as you deſire the welfare of thoſe for whoſe ſake eſpecially, you dare adventure to hazard even your own ſouls, bequeath not to them for a legacy a canker and moth, that will aſſuredly conſume and devour all your Riches: Take pitty of thoſe poor ſouls who are nothing intereſſed in their own perſons in thoſe crimes wherewith their wealth was purchaſed, and leave not unto them a curſe from God upon their inheritance. But, I ſee, I muſt be forc'd even abruptly to break from this Argument of Reſtitution; I come therefore, briefly, to my laſt particular, namely, the exceſs and extraordinary meaſure of *Zacchæus* his Reſtitution, which he profeſſeth ſhall be *four-fold*, to be diſpatch'd in one word.

44. However I found it ſomething a hard task to clear my firſt particular of Confeſſion, from the danger and neighbourhood of Popery, yet, I fear, that in moſt mens opinions, it will prove more difficult to do as much for this: For here is an Action perform'd by *Zacchæus*, (namely, Four-fold Reſtitution) without all queſtion, good and acceptable to God, and yet not enjoyn'd by vertue of any Commandement, and, What is that, but plain Popiſh Super-erogation? For, the Judicial Law of reſtoring four-fold, is only in ſtrictneſs and propriety applicable to plain direct Stealing. *Partic.* 2. *Object.*

45. I confeſs, that ſome particular men, for fear of this conſequence, have thought themſelves oblig'd to diſſent not only from St. *Paul*'s diſtinction of counſels from Precepts in the Goſpel, but alſo from the Gene- *Sol.*

ral uniform conſent of all Antiquity: Whereas, if we ſhall well conſider it, they have feared where no fear was: For, our Churches never condemned that diſtinction, as if there were danger from thence of making way for Popery: But this is that abomination of a more then Phariſaical ſelf-juſtifying Pride in the Church of *Rome*; that upon ſo weak a foundation they have moſt inartificially erected their *Babel* of Super-erogation, whereby they teach that they cannot only through the whole courſe of their lives exactly perform all the Commandements of God, without offending in any one mortal ſin; by this means challenging at Gods hands Remiſsion of their Sins, and everlaſting Salvation for themſelves; But alſo by their voluntary unrequired obedience unto Evangelical Counſels, leave God in arrearages unto them, and make an extraordinary ſtock of merits, which ſhall be left unto the Popes care and providence to mannage, and diſpenſe to any mans uſe for ready money. This is that Doctrin which the Church of *England*, in expreſs words, moſt worthily profeſſeth a deteſtation unto, in their 14th Article, which hath been tranſcribed into the 45th of this Church. And yet for all this, neither of theſe Churches have any quarrel to that diſtinction of St. *Paul*, (when ſpeaking of voluntary Chaſtity, he ſaith, I have
1 Cor. 7. 25. received no ſuch Commandement from the Lord, yet I give my advice or counſel,) as hath been excellently diſcovered by the late incomparable Biſhop of *Wincheſter* in his *Reſp. ad Apologiam*.

46. And now though I have gone through and quite abſolv'd my Text, yet I can ſcarſe think my Sermon finiſh'd, till I have endeavoured to make it beneficial unto you by applying it to your Conſciences and practiſe: But when I ſhould come to that, I confeſs, I find theſe times wherein we live ſo indiſpoſed for ſuch an Application, that I know not which way to begin with you: For, ſhall I ſeriouſly enjoyn you, as by a Precept from God, that where you have unjuſtly oppreſs'd, or cunningly and cloſely defrauded your Neighbour, that you ſhould, as *Zacchæus* did here, reſtore unto him four-fold? No, I dare not adventure ſo farr, I have received no ſuch Commandement from the Lord: and then, I ſhould be guilty of that which was an unjuſt accuſation laid upon *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Ye take too much upon you ye ſons of* Levi.

47. Shall I then endeavour to perſwade you to conform your ſelves to this pattern of *Zacchæus*, as to a Counſel? Alas the times are ſuch, that well were we if as ſome have turn'd all Counſels into Precepts, that the ſame men would not at leaſt in their practice convert all Precepts into Counſel: If they would not think that the Moral Legal Precepts were antiquated and diſſolved by bringing in the New Covenant of Grace! Or, if not quite abrogated, yet left ſo arbitrary, that they ſhould become matters of no neceſſary importance and conſequence, duties, which if we ſhall perform, we ſhall thereby approve our gratitude and thankfulneſs unto God our Saviour; and yet, if by chance they be left undone, ſince they are eſteem'd no neceſſary conditions of the New-Covenant, there is no great danger as long as we can keep a ſpark of faith alive, as long as we can perſwade our ſelves that we have a firm perſwaſion of Gods mercy in Chriſt to our ſelves in particular (which kind of newly invented faith, an Adverſary of

our

our Church pleaſantly, and I fear too truly defines, when he ſays, It is nothing but a ſtrong fancy. Dr. *Carrier* in his Epiſtle to K. *James*.

48. Theſe things therefore conſidered, I will leave the application of *Zacchæus* his extraordinary Reſtitution to your own Conſciences, according as God and your own ſouls ſhall agree together: Only I beſeech you, not to make a counſel of Reſtitution in general, but to free your ſelves from the burden and weight of other mens Riches, leſt they over-leaven and ſwell you ſo unmeaſurably, that you ſhall not be able to preſs in at that ſtraight gate, which would lead you unto thoſe bleſſed and glorious habitations which Chriſt hath purchaſed for you, not with theſe corruptible things of ſilver and gold, but with his own precious bloud: Unto which habitations God of his infinite mercy bring us all, for the ſame our Lord Jeſus Chriſt his ſake, To whom with the Father, *&c.*

The Eighth Sermon.

GAL. V. 5.

For we through the Spirit, wait for the hope of Righteouſneſs by Faith.

THis day the wiſdome of the ancient Primitive, and, I think, Apoſtolick Church hath dedicated to the memory of an Epiphany, or Apparition of a miraculous Star, which was ſent to guide the *Magi*, or Wiſemen of the Eaſt, to the place where our Saviour was born. But ſuppoſe there were ſuch a Star ſeen, and three men of the Eaſt conducted by it; muſt all the Chriſtian world preſently fall a rejoycing for it? There was reaſon indeed, that they ſhould be exceeding glad, but ſhall we therefore loſe a whole day's labour by it. To ſay the truth, there is no reaſon for it: therefore either better grounds muſt be found out for our rejoycing, or it were well done to make Chriſt-maſs a day ſhorter hereafter.

2. But for all this, if we well conſider it, we Gentiles might better ſpare any Holiday in the year than this; for there is none beſides this, properly our own, but the Jewes will challenge an equal intereſt in it. The appearing of the Star, then, is the leaſt part of the ſolemnity of this day: For a greater and more glorious light than the Star this day aroſe unto us, even that ſo long expected *Light which was to lighten the Gentiles, which was to give light to them which ſate in darkneſs, and in the ſhadow of death, and to guid our feet in the way of peace.* This day, as
Tit. II. 12. *S. Paul* ſaith, Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, There was an Epiphany likewiſe of the grace of God, to wit, the Goſpel; which now, as on this day, began to *bring ſalvation*, not to the Jews only, but *to all men*, even to us ſinners of the Gentiles, of whom thoſe three wiſe men were the firſt fruits. And, to ſay the truth, the appearing of Chriſt himſelf, unleſs he had brought with him this light to lighten the Gentiles in his hand, had not been ſufficient to make a Solemn day for us. The Star then *was not that light, but it was ſent to bear witneſs of that light*, namely, the Goſpel, the

the glory whereof fills my text fuller than the Majesty of God ever fill'd the Temple. For here we have the whole nature of the Gospel comprehended and straitned within the narrow compass of my Text, yet no part of it left out; yea, we have not only the Gospel discovered by its own light as it is in it self, but in comparison with those twinkling cloudy stars of Jewish Ordinances, and that once-glorious, but now eclipsed light, the Law of Works: since then, this is the day which the Lord hath made for us, we will rejoyce and be glad in it, and we will be ready to hearken, especially to any thing that shall be spoken concerning our Epiphany; concerning that blessed light, for many ages removed out of our sight, and as on this day beginning to appear in our Horizon.

3. The words of my Text, I find so full and swelling with expression, so fruitful and abounding in rich sense, that I am almost sorry I have said so much of them to fit them to this day: But, in recompence, I will spare the labour of shewing their dependance and connexion with the preceding part of the Epistle, and consider them as a loose severed Thesis. In which is contain'd, not only the sum and extract of this Epistle, but likewise of Christian Religion in general, in opposition both to the Mosaical Law given to the Jews; and the Law of Works, call'd also the Moral Natural Law, which from the beginning of the world hath been assented to, and written in the hearts of all mankind. The sense of which words, if they were inlarg'd, may be this. "*We* Christians, by "the tenour and prescript of our Religion, *expect the hope of Righteous-*"*ness, i.* the reward which we hope for by righteousness; not as those, "vain Teachers newly sprung up among you *Galatians*, would have us, "by obedience unto the carnal Ceremonial Law of *Moses*; but *through* "*the Spirit, i.* by a spiritual worship; neither by performing the old Co-"venant of works, which we are not able to fulfil, but *by faith*, by such "an obedience as is prescribed unto us in the Gospel. *We through the* "*Spirit wait*, &c.

4. In these words then, which comprehend the compleat essence of the Covenant of Grace, we may consider, First, the conditions on mans part required, in these words, *through the Spirit*, and *by Faith*. Secondly, upon the performance of our duty, there follows Gods promise, or the condition which God will make good unto us, and that is, *the hope of Righteousness*, or Justification. In the former part, namely, the obedience which is required from us Christians, we may consider it, first, in opposition to the Mosaical Law, by these words, *through the Spirit*; which import, that it is not such an outward carnal obedience, as *Moses* his Law required; but an internal Spiritual worship of the heart and soul. Secondly, the opposition of this new Covenant, to the old Covenant of Works, in these words, *by Faith*; which signifie, that we do not hope for salvation by the works of the Law, but by the Righteousness of Faith or the Gospel. In the second General, we may likewise observe, first, the nature of Justification, which comprehends the promises which God has been pleased to propose to us as the reward of our obedience. Secondly, the interest which we Christians in this life after we have perform'd our duties, may have in these promises, which is Hope, express'd in these words, *We wait for the hope*, &c. Of these ——

1. 2. I. 1. 2. II. 1. 2.

5. First then of the Covenant of Grace, as it is distinguish'd from the Mosaical Law by these words: *through the Spirit.* Where we will consider the nature of the Jewish Law, and wherein it is distinguish'd from the Christian. When Almighty God, with a high hand and a stretched out arm, had rescued the people of Israel from the Ægyptian slavery, and brought them in safety into the Wilderness, intending then to settle and reduce them into good order and government himself, and, by common voluntary consent, they all agreed to submit themselves to whatsoever laws he shall prescribe unto them, as we find *Exod.* 19. from 3d to the 9th verse. So that afterwards, *Judg.* 8. when the people, after an unexpected glorious victory obtain'd by *Gideon*, would have made him a King, and have setled the government in his house: No, saith *Gideon*, (*v.* 23.) *I will not rule over you, neither shall my Son, rule over you, The Lord shall rule over you.* And likewise afterward when *Samuel* complained to God of the perverseness of the people, who were weary of his government, and would have a King, as the Nations round about them had: Thou art deceived, saith God, It is my government that they are weary of; *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me*, and now are risen up in rebellion against me, to depose me from that Dominion which with their free consents I assumed: For which intolerable base ingratitude of that Nation, in his wrath he gives them a King, he appoints his Successour, which revenged those injuries and indignities offered to Almighty God, to the uttermost upon them.

Exod. 19. 3, &c. Judg. 8.

V. 23.

6. Now during the time of Gods reign over them, never any King was so careful to provide wholesome laws both for Church and Common-wealth, as He was: Insomuch, as he bids them look about, and consider the nations round about them, If ever any people was furnished with Laws and Ordinances, of such equity and righteousness, as theirs were: which Laws, because they were ordained by Angels, in the hand of a Mediator, namely *Moses*, are commonly called by the name of the Mosaical Law, and are penned down at large by him in his last four Books.

7. The Precepts and prohibitions of this Law, are of several natures: For some duties therein enjoyn'd, are such as in their own natures have an intrinsecal essential goodness and righteousness in them, and the contrary to them, are in themselves evil, and would have been so, though they had never been expresly prohibited: Such are especially the 10. Words or Precepts written by Gods own finger in the two Tables of stone: Other Precepts concern matters of their own nature indifferent, and are only to be termed good, because they were commanded by a positive divine Law; such are the Ceremonial Washings, Purifications, Sacrifices, &c. A third sort are of a mixt nature, the objects of which, are, for the most part, things in their own nature, good or evil; but yet the circumstances annex'd unto them, are meerly arbitrary and alterable, as namely, those things which are commanded or forbidden by that which is commonly called the Judicial Law: for example: The Law of fourfold Restitution of things stollen. Theft of its own nature is evil, and deserves punishment: But that the punishment thereof should be such a kind of Restitution, is not in it self necessary, but may be chang'd either into a corporal

poral puniſhment, or, it may be, into a civil death, according as thoſe who have the government of Kingdoms and States ſhall think fit and convenient for the diſpoſitions of the times wherein they live, as we ſee by experience in the practiſe of our own Kingdoms. For the due execution of which Laws, and puniſhment of tranſgreſſours, God appointed Judges and Rulers; and where they failed through want of care or partiality, himſelf many times would immediately and perſonally inflict the puniſhment.

8. Now the general Sanction of this whole Law is expreſſed *Deut.* 27. *v.* 26 in theſe words, *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all the words of this Law to do them:* which curſe, as we find it afterwards at large interpreted, imported a ſudden violent untimely death, together with all kind of misfortune, that could make this life miſerable: ſo that he was liable to this Curſe that ſwerved in any one point or circumſtance, from what was contained in that Law. Notwithſtanding, in ſome caſes, God was pleaſed to remit the rigour of this curſe, and to accept of certain gifts and offerings, and the expiatory ſacrifices of beaſts, as it were, in exchange for the lives of the delinquents. I ſhould but fruitleſly trifle away the time in inſiſting any longer upon the nature and quality of the Moſaical Law. I will now, as I am required by my Text, ſhew you the extream difference, and incomparable excellency of the Covenant of Grace, or the Goſpel beyond this, in ſeveral reſpects. Deut. 27. 26.

9. As firſt: The Moral Duties of the two Tables, as they are part of the Moſaical Jewiſh Law required only an external obedience and conformity to the Affirmative precepts thereof, and an abſtaining from an outward practiſe of the Negative. They did not reach unto the conſcience, no more then the National Laws of other Kingdoms do: ſo that for example, where the Law of *Moſes* forbids Adultery upon pain of death, he that ſhould in his heart luſt with any woman, could not be accounted a tranſgreſſour of *Moſes* his Law, neither was he liable to the puniſhment therein ſpecified: whereas the Goſpel requires not only an outward, and, as I may ſay, corporal obedience to Gods commandements, but alſo an inward ſanctification of the ſoul and conſcience upon the ſame penalty of everlaſting damnation with the former. And what is now ſaid of the moral precepts (as they art part of *Moſes* his Law) by the ſame proportion likewiſe, is to be underſtood of the Judicial.

10. Notwithſtanding what hath now been ſaid: yet we muſt know, that theſe very Jews, to whom this Law was given, being the children of *Abraham*, were heirs likewiſe of the promiſes which were made unto him and his ſeed; And the way or means whereby they were to attain unto theſe promiſes, were the very ſame by which himſelf obtained them, namely, Faith. So that this Moſaical Law (whatſoever glorious opinion the Jews had of it) was not that Covenant whereby they were to ſeek for Juſtification in the ſight of God. Till Chriſt's coming, there was no Law given, which could have given life, that is, which could promiſe everlaſting life unto man; not the Law of works by reaſon of mans imperfection and weakneſs; not the Law of *Moſes*, by reaſon of its own weakneſs, as S. *Paul* clearly demonſtrates, eſpecially in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

11. For

11. For what end then was the Law of *Moſes* given? S. *Paul* ſhall
Gal. 3. 19. anſwer the queſtion, *Gal.* 3. 19. It *was added* (ſaith he) *becauſe of tranſgreſſions, till the ſeed ſhould come to whom the promiſes were made.* It was added, as if he ſhould ſay, After the promiſes made unto *Abraham* and his ſeed, this Law was moreover annexed, not as any new condition whereby they were to attain unto the promiſes, but that, in the mean time, till the promiſes were fulfilled, they ſhould be reſtrained, as it were, and kept under a ſtrict outward diſcipline, from running into any exceſs of diſobedience: for thoſe, whom perhaps the goodneſs and mercy of God, in affording them thoſe promiſes, would not by the hope of them be able to bridle, they notwithſtanding, when they ſaw puniſhment even unto death without mercy inflicted upon the tranſgreſſours, they would be more careful of their waies. It followes, *Till the ſeed ſhould come to whom the promiſes were made*; or as himſelf in *Heb.* 9.
Heb. 9. 10. alters the phraſe, *till the time of reformation*: that is, When Chriſt, who was that bleſſed Seed, promiſed to *Abraham*, ſhould come, he would ſo clearly and convincingly ſhew unto the world the way of Salvation that they ſhould no longer need to be kept under their old Schoolmaſter, the Law; and therefore at his coming, the date of the whole Moſaical Law ſhould expire. And that may be one reaſon why S. *Paul* is in this chapter ſo violent againſt thoſe that would urge the obſervation of the Moſaical Law; foraſmuch as by inforcing it now when the ſeed was already come, to whom the promiſes were made, they did ſeem to evacuate the Coming and Goſpel of Chriſt.

12. Now, that the Moſaical Law was not given to the Jews for this end, that by the fulfilling thereof, they ſhould promiſe to themſelves the reward of righteouſneſs, everlaſting life; is evidently demonſtrated, both by our Saviour in the 5. of *Matthew*, and by S. *Paul* through all his Epiſtles, but eſpecially in that to the *Hebrews*. The force and vertue of whoſe arguments, may in general be reduc'd to that iſſue which before I mentioned, *viz.* That the Law, by the performance whereof we may expect life, requires not only an external conformity to the outward works, but an inward ſpiritual ſanctification alſo of the ſoul and heart.

13. But what ſaith the Law of *Moſes*? *It was ſaid*, ſaith our Saviour,
Mat. 5. 21. *by them of old*, *i.* in the Law of *Moſes*, *Thou ſhalt not kill*; not, Thou ſhalt not be angry, thou ſhalt not bear malice in thy heart: ſo that if thou abſtaineſt from Murder, thou fulfilleſt *Moſes* his Law; *And if thou doeſt kill, thou ſhalt be in danger of Judgement*, *i.* the only puniſhment which the Law of *Moſes* inflicted upon the tranſgreſſours thereof, was the danger to be condemn'd to death by the Judgement, or Bench of Judges appointed for the execution of this Law. *But I ſay unto you*; I, who clearly ſhew unto you that way wherein you muſt walk, before you can promiſe to your ſelves any hope of eternal life; I ſay unto you, not only, whoſoever ſhall kill his neighbour, but whoſoever out of malice
V. 22. or rancour, *ſhall ſay unto his brother, Thou fool, ſhall be in danger of Hell*
V. 27. *fire*. So likewiſe, not only he which commits Adultery in the outward act, is culpable by my Goſpel before God, but alſo he which looks upon
V. 33. a woman to luſt after her in his heart. And ſo inſtead of Forſwearing and breaking of Oaths, and Vows, which *Moſes* his Law forbad; Chriſt
V. 38. condemns fruitleſs and unneceſſary, though true, Oaths. Inſtead of the

Law

Law of Retaliation of injuries, Christ commands rather to suffer a second injury, than to revenge the first.

14. But in the last place, the last Example which our Saviour gives, may seem to destroy this collection which hath been drawn out of this Chapter: for, saith he Vers. 43. *You have heard, that it hath been said of old, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.* What! did *Moses* his Law then permit a man to bear hatred and malice unto another? Did I say, permit them? Nay, it commanded them so perfectly to hate their enemies, to wit, the seven Nations who possessed that land, which was theirs by promise, mentioned *Exod.* 34. 2. *Deut.* 7. 1. to which were added the *Amalekites*, *Exod.* 27. 19. *Deut.* 30. 19. That they were enjoyned to destroy them utterly, old and young, men, women, and children, even to the very cattel, without all pity and consideration. Insomuch, that *Saul*, for his unseasonable pity but of one person, and that a King of the *Amalekites*, and reserving the best of the cattel for sacrifice to God, had the Kingdom utterly rent from him and his posterity. Whereas, by our Saviour, in the words of S. *Paul*, Enmity is slain: No enemies now in Christianity, but all neighbours, and friends, and brethren; nay more, If any one will needs be your enemy, love him notwithstanding, saith Christ, *If he curse you, bless him; If he hate you, do good unto him; If he use you despitefully, and persecute you, pray for him.* To conclude this argument from our Saviour's authority; Christ adds, as a Corollary to his discourse, speaking to his Disciples and followers, *Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, i.* whereas they content themselves with an outward carnal obedience to the Law, unless you, besides this, add a spiritual sanctification of the mind, *ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* I deny not now, but that there may be a mystical spiritual sense even of this Law, and an application thereof almost as perfect, as is express'd in the Gospel, which those who were guided extraordinarily by the Spirit of God, and with help of Tradition, might collect out of it; As the Prophet *David*, *Psal.* 19. where he saith, *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the Commandement of the Lord is pure, enlightning the eyes, &c.* And in this sense, the succeeding Prophets endeavoured to perswade the people to apprehend it. But this was a forc'd sense of *Moses* his Law, not primarily intended by the author; it was no proper natural meaning of it.

Exod. 34. 2. Deut. 7. 1. Exod. 27. 19. Deut. 30. 19. V. 20. Psal. 19. 7.

15. Proportionably to this Doctrine of our Saviour, S. *Paul*, speaking of *Moses* his Law, considered in its proper natural and direct sense, and as extreamly unsufficient to Justifie a man in the sight of God, calls it ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, *weak and beggerly elements*, Gal. 4. 9. And, Νόμον τῆς ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς, *a Law of a carnal commandment*, Heb. 7. 16. *i.* a Law which a carnal man, one not guided by the Spirit of God, might perform. And, *a Law which made no man perfect*, Heb. 7. 19. Nay more, saith he, it is *not* ἄμεμπτος, *not without fault*, Heb. 8. 7. *i.* a man might perform the Law of *Moses*, and yet not be ἄμεμπτος, He may be a wicked man still in Gods sight; for all his Legal Righteousness, he may remain dead in trespasses and sins. Insomuch, as the same *Paul*, speaking of himself, before he was converted to Christianity, saies he, *Concerning the righteousness which is of the Law, I was blameless*; I did so exactly fulfill

Gal. 4. 9. Heb. 7. 16. *Ibid.* v. 19. Heb. 8. 7. Phil. 3. 6.

fulfil that measure of Righteousness, which *Moses* his Law required of me; that, in respect of that Law, I was a guiltless innocent person; I could justifie my self; I durst with confidence oppose my self in Judgement, to the censure of our most severe strict Judges.

16. But what then? Durst *Paul* with this his Legal Righteousness appear before God, as expecting to be Justified in his sight, as claiming any interest in the promises of eternal life, by virtue of this his innocency? By no means: No, saith he, though I were blameless, as concerning this righteousness which is of the Law, though I had all the priviledges
Phil. 3. 6. that any Jew could be capable of, *circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the Tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, according to the Law a Pharisee, (i. e.* of that Sect which had preserved the Law in
V. 6. the greatest integrity) though I were *so zealous thereof, that I persecuted the Churches* of Christ, which sought to abrogate it: and lastly, though *concerning the Righteousness of the Law, I was blameless.* Yet, notwithstanding all these, I will have no better an opinion of these priviledges than they deserve; I will account them only outward carnal priviledges; If I at all rejoyce in them, yet this I will account only *a rejoycing in the flesh.* Far be it from me, to think to appear before Christ with such a righteousness as this is. God forbid I should expect to be accepted of by him, for these carnal outward priviledges: Nay, so far am I from that, that, whatsoever I thought, before I knew him, to be a gain and a prerogative unto me, now that I have attain'd to the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, *I account as loss,* as things likely to be rather a hindrance unto me; yea, as dross and dung, and *desire to be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the Law*: For, alas, how mean, and unworthy will that appear in his eyes? *but the righteousness which is of Faith, the righteousness which is of God by Faith.* The former righteousness was mine own, and therefore could not stand in his sight; but that righteousness to which Faith or the Gospel directs me, proceeds not from my own strength, but only from God, who will crown his own graces in me.

17. I have thus far shew'd you, both from our Saviour's authority, and S. *Paul*'s likewise; that the performing of the Moral Duties as far as they were inforc'd, by virtue of *Moses* his Law, could not make a man capable of attaining to the promises of the New Covenant. And (that I may add one confirmation of this more out of the Old Testament) hereupon it is, that God by the Prophet *Ezekiel* manifestly sheweth, that God gave not the Law of *Moses* to the Israelites, for this end, that they should think that the performance of that Law, was all the duty which they owed unto God; or that that obedience could make them accepted of him unto eternal life: No, saith he, if you have any such conceit of those Ordinances, *The Statutes which I gave them, were not good, and the Judgements such, as they should not live by them.* I will now proceed to shew you the weakness and unprofitableness of the Ceremonial part of *Moses* his Law likewise, for such a purpose; and that by Arguments taken from S. *Paul*, especially out of that his most Divine Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

18. The first argument shall be drawn out of the 9th Chapter of that Epistle, the sum whereof is this: The first Covenant, which had *Ordi-*

nances

nances of Divine Service, and a worldly Sanctuary, which conſiſted in meats and drinks, and divers waſhings, and carnal ordinances impoſed on them till the time of reformation, in which alſo were offered gifts and ſacrifices; yet with all theſe Ceremonies and Formalities, they could enter no deeper than the fleſh, *they could not make him which did the ſervice perfect, as pertaining to the conſcience*: That is, for example; thoſe Expiatory Sacrifices which were to be offered for him which had tranſgreſſed, they abſolved him indeed from a civil carnal puniſhment, but they could not reach to the conſcience; that remained ſtill as guilty and defiled before God, as ever it was. And can it be imagined, that a man ſo qualified, with ſuch an accuſing condemning conſcience, could with any hope or confidence appear before God, as expecting to be freed from the danger of Hell, for the coſt or ceremony of a Sacrifice? Thoſe Sacrifices therefore and Ceremonies, *the blood of bulls and of goats, and the aſhes of an heyfer, ſprinkling the unclean, might ſanctifie a man to the purifying of the fleſh*, and that is all they could do; and ſo far they could ſanctifie even the moſt profane perſon, or the veriеſt Hypocrite in the world: *But it muſt be only the blood of Chriſt, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himſelf without ſpot unto God, that is able to purge our conſciences from dead works to ſerve the living God.*

Heb. 10. 16. V. 9. V. 13. V. 14.

19. But it may be objected, The Baptizing and waſhing of us Chriſtians, and our Commemoration of the true Sacrifice, are powerful and effectual, even to the ſanctification of the ſoul and ſpirit: And why ſhould not the water of Jordan have as much virtue in it, during *Moſes* his Law, as it has had ſince, or as ours has now? Why ſhould not their pre-figuration of the true Sacrifice by typical ſacrifices, be as much worth as our poſt-commemoration thereof? for Chriſt was the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever. I anſwer, that Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, are proper inſtruments whereby the Sacrifice of Chriſt is applied, and made beneficial unto us, and were inſtituted for that and no other end: whereas, the proper and direct end of *Moſes* his Leiturgy and Ceremonies, were only civil carnal immunities; and though it be true, that the Legal Sacrifices were very apt and commodious, to ſhadow forth the Oblation and ſatisfaction of Chriſt; yet this uſe of them was ſo myſtical and reſerved, ſo impoſſible to be collected out of the Letter of the Law, that without a ſpecial Revelation from God, the eyes of the Iſraelites were too weak to ſerve them to pierce through thoſe dark clouds and ſhadows, and to carry their obſervation to the ſubſtance: ſo that I conceive thoſe ſacrifices of the Law, in this reſpect, are a great deal more beneficial to us Chriſtians; for there is a great difference between Sacraments and Types; Types are only uſeful after the Antitype is diſcovered, for the confirmation of their Faith that follow. As for example, *Abraham's* offering of *Iſaac* by faith, did lively repreſent the real Oblation of Chriſt, but in that reſpect, was of little or no uſe till Chriſt was indeed crucified; it being impoſſible to make that hiſtory a ground-work of their Faith in Chriſt. The like may be ſaid of the Legal Sacrifices.

Obj.

Sol.

20. My ſecond Argument ſhall be taken out of thoſe words of S. *Paul*, Act. 13. 38. where, ſpeaking of Chriſt, he ſaith, *By him all that believe, are juſtified from all things, from which they could not be juſtified by*

Act. 13. 38.

by the Law of Moſes: From which I inferr, that ſince there were many ſins for which the Law of *Moſes* allowed no Sacrifice, no Redemption, no Satisfaction, no Commutation, in what a fearful deſperate caſe would a perſon that ſhould commit ſuch ſins be, if he were to expect Juſtification before God by the Law of *Moſes*, for that muſt needs lead him to deſpair? It could ſhew him no refuge, no Sanctuary to fly unto; nothing would remain unto ſuch a perſon but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation to conſume Gods Adverſary: And therefore no marvail if the ſame Apoſtle (*Heb.* 7. 17, 18.) ſaith, *That the former Law for the weakneſs and unprofitableneſs thereof (i. e.* to Juſtification*) was to be diſannull'd*, ſince it could make nothing perfect.

Heb. 7. 17, 18.

21. The laſt Argument ſhall be inferr'd from that ſaying of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 8. 6. where ſpeaking of the New-Covenant of Grace, he ſaith, *It was eſtabliſhed on better promiſes*, namely, than the *Jewiſh* Covenant was: For all the happineſs which was to be expected from *Moſes* his Law, was only an exemption from the inconveniences and curſes of this life, long days and peaceable, enrich'd with worldly content and proſperity: Whereas the bleſſings which attend the performance of the New-Covenant or the Goſpel are unſpeakable and glorious, *Such as eye hath not ſeen*, nor indeed, as long as it is mortal, can ſee, *neither can the heart of man conceive them, being eternal in the Heavens.* Neither will the ordinary evaſion ſerve the turn, as if theſe temporal bleſſings, or plagues and curſes mentioned in *Moſes* his writings, ſhould purpoſely ſignifie the bleſſed eſtate of glorified Saints, or woes of the damned, for then St. *Paul*'s Argument would fall to the ground; and indeed, that whole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, would be rendred inconcluding, as might eaſily be demonſtrated, if the time, and throng of matter, which follows would permit.

Heb. 8. 6.

22. I would not now have you ſo conceive me, as if I would exclude the *Jews* of the Old-Teſtament from being partakers of the Promiſes of the Goſpel: No, God forbid: But, that which I have ſaid, is this, that they attain'd not unto them by performing *Moſes* his Law, but by the very ſame means by which we hope to be partakers of them, namely, by performing the ſubſtance of thoſe duties which are clearly delivered unto us in the Goſpel, and may be found ſprinkled in ſeveral places, even in *Moſes* his writings, and no queſtion but were more fully and compleatly delivered unto them by Tradition from their Fathers. And hereupon, I ſuppoſe, it is, that when any were converted to the knowledg and worſhip of the true God in thoſe times, they who made them Proſelytes, were not curious to enforce upon them the Obſervation of *Moſes* his Ordinances and Ceremonies, as we find in the behaviour of *Eliſha* to *Naaman* the *Aſſyrian*, of *Jonah* to the *Ninevites*, of *Daniel* to *Nebuchadnezzar*, and of the reſt of the Prophets to the *Tyrians*, *Moabites*, *Ægyptians*, to whom they writ, and whoſe converſion they ſought: None of which urged upon them the Obſervation of the *Moſaical* Liturgy as a thing neceſſary or needful to be obſerv'd by them: Indeed thoſe who were content to live amongſt the *Jews*, and enjoy their priviledges and immunities, were bound to undergo the burden and coſtlineſs of the Offerings and Sacrifices, which, as St. *Paul* ſaith, was ſo great, that they were both to themſelves and their fore-fathers intolerable.

23. I will

23. I will conclude this whole point of the difference between *Moſes* his Law, and the Law of Faith, or the Goſpel, in Gods own words by the Prophet, *Jer.* 31. 31. twice quoted by St. *Paul* in *Heb. ch.* 8. & *ch.* 10. where God ſaith, *Behold the dayes come ſaith the Lord, that I will make a New-Covenant with the Houſe of Iſrael, and with the Houſe of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, which my Covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, ſaith the Lord: But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with them, After thoſe dayes, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Laws in their hearts, and write them in their inward parts, &c.* As if he ſhould ſay, The former Covenant which I made with them by *Moſes*, was only written in two Tables of Stone, as the *Roman* Laws were in 12. Tables, and required only an outward conformity and obedience for the which they did not need an inward ſanctifying ſpiritual Grace to enable them, as the New Covenant of Grace doth. And therefore for the performing of that, I will abundantly afford and ſupply them with all the Graces of my Holy Spirit. Jer. 31. 31.

24. But a little to interrupt this Text: You will ſay, What, had not the Jews God's Law written in their hearts alſo? did not they worſhip him in Spirit as well as we? No queſtion: But this they did not as commanded by *Moſes* his Law, but by that Covenant made with *Abraham*, and by him traduced unto them. It follows, *And I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people, i. e.* I will be their God after a more eſpecial manner then I was unto them in the Wilderneſs; I will not only be their King to govern them in peace and tranquillity, out of the danger and fear of their Enemies the Nations about them, and preſerve them ſafe in the promiſed Land; but I will keep them from the fury and malice of their ſpiritual Enemies that would ſeek to deſtroy their ſouls, and I will bring them to a Land infinitely exceeding theirs, and whereof the Land of *Canaan* was but a moſt unproportionable type and ſhadow, even mine own bleſſed and glorious Kingdom, reſerved in the higheſt Heavens, for them who ſincerely perform the conditions of my New Covenant. Thus farr as largely as ſo ſmall a meaſure of time would permit me, I have told you the difference betwixt the Covenant of Grace and *Moſes* his Law, imply'd in theſe words of my Text, *through the Spirit:* I come now to my ſecond particular, namely, the diſtinction of the ſame Covenant of Grace from the Law of works, wherein I ſhall proceed by the ſame method, *i. e.* ſhewing you firſt abſolutely the nature of thoſe Laws, and then the ſeveral differences betwixt them.

25. The Law of Works is the ſame with that, to the obedience whereof *Adam* was oblig'd in Paradiſe with this exception, that beſides the Moral natural Law written in his heart, (the ſubſtance whereof is to this day reſerved in the minds of all the ſons of *Adam*) *Adam* had a ſecond poſitive Law injoyn'd him by God, namely, the forbidding him to eat of the Tree of Good and Evil: which one Precept cannot properly be call'd a part of the Law of Works, or Nature, ſince the Action thereby forbidden was not of its own nature evil, but only made unlawful by vertue of God's prohibition: Excepting therefore this one particular Precept, the Law which was given to *Adam*, (call'd the Law of Works),

comprehended in it all kind of moral duties referr'd either to God, his Neighbour, or Himself, which have in them a natural essential goodness, or righteousness; and, by consequence, the prohibition, of all manner of actions, words, or thoughts, which are in themselves contrary to Justice, and Reason. All these Precepts are generally suppos'd to be contained in the Ten Words written by Gods own finger in two Tables of Stone; though, with submission, I think, that those two Tables contain only directly the moral duties of man to God and his Neighbour: for it will require much forcing and straining to bring in the duties and sins of a man against his own person within that compass, as Temperance, Sobriety, and their opposites, Gluttony, Drunkenness, Self-incontinency, *&c.*

26. The Obligation to this Law is so strict, severe and peremptory, That it required not only an universal Obedience to whatsoever is contained in that Law, in the full extent, latitude, and perfection thereof, but that continual without interruption through the whole course of a man's life: Insomuch, that he that should but once transgress it in the least point or circumstance, should without redemption, or dispensation, be rendred culpable as of the breach of the whole Law, and remain lyable to the malediction thereof. And to this Law in this strictness mentioned are all men living oblig'd, who are out of Christ, and who either know not of him, or are not willing to submit themselves to his New Covenant.

27. The Justification which was due to the performance of this Law by Justice, and as the wages thereof, that is, the condition wherein God oblig'd himself to such as fulfill'd it, was the promises of this life, and that which is to come; Long, happy and peaceable days in this world, and in their due time a translation to the joys and glory of heaven: This Justification did not comprehend Remission of Sins, as ours does, for the Law excluded all hope of pardon after sin, no promise made to repentance, repentance would do no good: The Court wherein they were to be judg'd was a Court of meer rigorous Justice, Justice rejoyc'd over and against Mercy, Grace, Loving-kindness, and all those blessed and glorious Attributes, whereby God for our Saviour Jesus Christ his sake is pleased and delighted to be known unto the world.

28. This Law in the rigour thereof might easily have been perform'd by *Adam*; he had that perfection of grace and holiness given him, which was exactly equal and commensurable to whatsoever duties were enjoyn'd him: But by his wilful voluntary (God forbid, we should say enforc'd, or absolutely decree'd) prevarication he utterly undid both himself and his posterity, leaving them engag'd for his debts, and as much of their own, without almost any money to pay them: Without Christ, we are all oblig'd to the same strictness and severity of the Law, which by reason of our poverty and want of grace, is become impossible to be perform'd by us: As the blessed Apostle St. *Paul* hath evidently proved by Induction, in the beginning of his Epistle to the *Romans*: In the first chapter, declaring that the Gentiles neither did, nor could perform the Law; in the second, saying as much for the Jews; and in the third, joyning them both together in the same miserable desperate estate. The conclusion of his whole discourse is, *All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.* Thus much, for the Law of Works.

27. The

29. The ſtate of mankind without Chriſt, being ſo deplored, ſo out of all hope, as I told you: Almighty God out of his infinite mercy and goodneſs, by his unſpeakable wiſdom found out an attonement, accepting of the voluntary exinanition and humiliation of his dearly beloved Son, who ſubmitted himſelf, to be made fleſh, to all our natural infirmities (ſin only excepted) and at laſt to dye that ignominious accurſed death of the Croſs for the Redemption of mankind; Who in his death made a Covenant with his Father, that thoſe, and only thoſe, who would be willing to ſubmit themſelves to the obedience of a new Law, which he would preſcribe unto mankind, ſhould for the merits of his obedience and death be juſtified in the ſight of God, have their ſins forgiven them, and be made heirs of everlaſting glory: Now, that Chriſt's death was in order of Nature, before the giving of the Goſpel, is (I think) evident by thoſe words of St. *Paul*, *Heb. 9. 16, 17.* where comparing the old Covenant of the Jews with that of Chriſt, he ſaith, *Where a Teſtament is, there muſt of neceſſity be the death of the Teſtatour: for a Teſtament is of force after men are dead, otherwiſe it is of no ſtrength at all while the Teſtatour liveth; whereupon neither the firſt Covenant was dedicated without bloud. It was neceſſary therefore* (ſaith he, ver. 23.) *that the patterns of things in heaven ſhould be purified with theſe, i. e.* with the bloud of Beaſts, *but the heavenly things themſelves with better things than theſe*, namely, with the bloud of Chriſt. Heb. 9. 16,16

30. Which Covenant of Chriſt (call'd in Scripture the New-Covenant, the Covenant of Grace, the grace of God, the Law of Faith) according to the nature of all Covenants being made between two parties (at the leaſt), requires conditions on both ſides, to be perform'd, and being a Covenant of Promiſe, the conditions on man's part muſt neceſſarily go before, otherwiſe they are no conditions at all: Now man's duty is comprehended by St. *Paul* in this word *Faith*, and God's promiſe in the word *Juſtification*: And thus farr we have proceeded upon ſure grounds, for we have plain expreſs words of Scripture for that which hath been ſaid: But the main difficulty remains behind, and that is the true ſenſe and meaning of theſe two words, *Faith* and *Juſtification*, and what reſpect and dependance they have one of the other. Which difficulty by Gods aſſiſtance, and with your Chriſtian charitable patience, I will now endeavour to diſſolve.

31. For the firſt therefore, which is Faith; we may conſider it in ſeveral reſpects, to wit, firſt as referring us to and denoting the principal object of Evangelical Faith, which is Chriſt: Now, if Faith be meant in this ſenſe, (as by many good Writers of our Reformed Churches, it is underſtood) then the meaning of that ſo often repeated ſaying of St. *Paul*, *We are juſtified by Faith without the works of the Law*, muſt be, We are juſtifi'd only for the obedience of Chriſt, and not for our righteouſneſs of the Law, which is certainly a moſt Catholick Orthodox ſenſe, and not to be deny'd by any Chriſtian, though, I doubt, it does not expreſs all that St. *Paul* intended in that Propoſition. Secondly, Faith ſignifies the Act or exerciſe or duty of Faith, as it comprehends all Evangelical Obedience, call'd by St. *Paul*, *The Obedience of Faith*, Rom. 16. 26. *The Righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 4, 13. & 9. 13. & 10. 6. And it is an inherent grace or vertue, wrought in us by the powerful operation of God's Spirit: Or 1. 2. Rom. 16. 26. & 4 13. & 9. 13. & 10. 6.

Rom. 10. 9. Act. 20 32. Gal. 3. 2. Rom. 3. 27. thirdly, it may be taken for *the Doctrin of Faith*, call'd alſo by him, *the Word of Faith*, Rom. 10. 8. and *the Word of Gods Grace*, Act. 20. 32. and *the hearing of Faith*, Gal. 3. 2. In which ſenſe, as if he meant, the Word, St. *Paul* may ſeem to reſolve us, *Rom.* 3. 27. where he ſaith, *that boaſting is excluded by the Law of Faith*, which words are extant in the very heat of the controverſie of Juſtification. Now theſe ſenſes of Faith, if they be apply'd to that concluſion of St. *Paul*, *We are juſtified by Faith*, come all to one paſs, for in effect it is all one, to ſay, We are juſtifi'd by our Obedience, or Righteouſneſs of Faith; and to ſay, We are juſtifi'd by the Goſpel, which preſcribes that Obedience: As on the contrary, to ſay, We are juſtifi'd by the Law, or
4. by works preſcribed by the Law, is all one. There is a fourth acception of Faith, taken for the ſingle Habit or Grace of Faith, and apply'd to this propoſition (only of all Chriſtians that I have heard of) by the *Belgick* Remonſtrants: which being a new invented fancy, and therefore unwarrantable, yet I ſhall hereafter have occaſion it may be to ſay ſomething of it.

31. St. *Paul*'s Propoſition, I am perſwaded, excludes none of theſe ſenſes; it is capeble of them all: But, before I ſhew you how they may conſiſt together, I will, in the firſt place, declare of what nature that righteouſneſs is, which God by vertue of his New Covenant requires at our hands before he will make good his promiſe unto us. Firſt, then, God requires at our hands a ſincere Obedience unto the ſubſtance of all Moral duties of the Old Covenant, and that by the Goſpel: And this obedience is ſo neceſſary, that it is impoſſible any man ſhould be ſaved without it. The preſſing of this Doctrine takes up by much the greateſt part of the Evangelical Writings. Now, that theſe Duties are not enforc'd upon us, as conditions of the Old Covenant of Works, is evident, becauſe, by Chriſt we are freed from the Obligation of the Old Covenant: God forbids, that we ſhould have a thought of expecting the hope of righteouſneſs upon thoſe terms: For, that Covenant will not admit of any imperfection in our works, and then, in what a miſerable caſe are we! There is no hope for us, unleſs ſome courſe be taken, that not only our imperfections, but our ſins, and thoſe of a high nature, be paſs'd by, and overlook'd by Almighty God, as if He had loſt his eyes to ſee them, or his memory to remember them.

32. The ſubſtance then of the Moral Law is enjoyn'd us by the New-Covenant, but with what difference I ſhall ſhew you preſently. And hereupon it is that our Saviour ſaith to the *Phariſees*, who were willing to make any miſ-conſtruction of his Doctrine, *Think you that I am come to deſtroy the Law?* I, by all means, ſay we, God forbid elſe, for unleſs the old Law be deſtroy'd, we are undone; as long as that is alive, we are dead: If the Law of Works have its natural force ſtill, woe be to us. Therefore, that muſt not be Chriſt's meaning: His intent is, as if he ſhould ſay, Think you that I am come to deſtroy the righteouſneſs of the Law? to diſ-oblige men from the neceſſity of being good, holy, and vertuous? No, by no means; *I am not come to deſtroy the Law, but to fulfil it*: The righteouſneſs of the Law, according to the ſubſtance thereof, ſhall be as neceſſarily required by vertue of that New Covenant which I preach unto you, and to which I exhort you all to ſubmit your ſelves, as ever it was by the Old Covenant; only becauſe of your weakneſs and infirmity, I will abate the rigour of it: Thoſe who notwithſtanding my offer

offer of Grace and Pardon upon ſuch eaſie conditions as I preſcribe, will yet continue in an habitual ſtate of profaneneſs and irreligion ſhall be as culpable, nay, ten times more miſerable than if they never had heard of me, for their wilful neglecting ſo great ſalvation. *It is eaſier for Heaven and Earth to paſs away, than for one tittle of the Law to fail*: For God would be no looſer by the annihilation of the world, whereas if any part of the Moral Law ſhould expire, the very beams and rayes of Gods eſſential goodneſs ſhould be darkened and deſtroy'd.

33. In like manner ſaith St. *Paul*, Rom. 11. *ult. Do we make void the Law through Faith? God forbid: yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.* Now, if a ſucceeding Covenant eſtabliſheth any part of a Precedent, eſpecially, if there be any alteration made in the conditions eſtabliſhed, all obligation whatſoever is taken from the Old Covenant, and thoſe conditions are in force only by vertue of the New. When the *Norman* Conquerour was pleas'd to eſtabliſh and confirm to the *Engliſh* ſome of the ancient *Saxons* Laws, Are thoſe Laws then become in force as they are *Saxon?* No, for the Authority of the *Saxons*, the Authors of thoſe Laws, is ſuppoſed to be extinguiſhed, and therefore no power remains in them to look to the execution of them: But by the confirmation of the *Norman* they are become indeed *Norman* Laws, and are now in force, not becauſe they were firſt made by the *Saxons*, but only by vertue of the ſucceeding power of the *Norman* line. So likewiſe, when the Goſpel enjoyns the ſubſtance of the ſame duties which the old Covenant of Works required; Are we Chriſtians enforc'd to the obedience of them, becauſe they are duties of the Law? By no means! But only becauſe our Saviour and only Law-maker Jeſus Chriſt commands the ſame in the Law of Faith. Rom. 3. *ult.*

34. Thus far the New Covenant is in ſome terms of agreement with the Old, inaſmuch as the ſame Moral duties are enjoyn'd in them both, as parts of the conditions of both. But the difference herein is, That the Law commands a preciſe exact fulfilling of theſe Precepts, (as I told you before) which the Goſpel deſcending to our infirmities, remits and qualifies much: For in the Goſpel, he is accounted to fulfil the moral Precepts, that obeys them according to that meaſure of Grace which God is pleas'd to allow him; that obeys God, though not with a perfect, yet with a ſincere upright heart; that when he is overcome with a temptation to ſin, continues not in it, but recovers himſelf to his former righteouſneſs by Repentance and new Obedience: Thus much then for the moral Precepts and with what difference they are commanded in the Old and New Covenant.

35. In the ſecond place, there is another part of Evangelical Obedience, which is purely Evangelical, and which has no commerce nor reference at all to the Law, and that is the Grace of Repentance: For ſaith St. *Paul*, Act. 17. 30. *But now (that is by the Goſpel) God commands all men every where to repent.* Now Repentance implies a ſerious conſideration and acknowledgment of that miſerable eſtate whereunto our ſins have brought us, and thereupon an hearty unfeigned ſorrow for them, a perfect hatred and deteſtation of them, inferring a full peremptory reſolution to break them off, and interrupt the courſe of them by new obedience. This, I ſay, is an obedience purely Evangelical, The Law of Works did not at all meddle with it, neither indeed could it: The Law condemns a man aſſoon as ever he Act. 17 30.

is guilty of the breach thereof, and makes no promiſe at all of Remiſſion of ſins upon Repentance; but rather quite excludes it. Yet from the grace of Repentance, we may gather a forcible argument to make good that which before we ſpoke concerning the Renewing of the Moral Precepts in the New Covenant. For no reaſonable man can deny, that Repentance is abſolutely neceſſary before a man can be Juſtified. Now what is that for which (for example) a new converted Heathen repents, but the breach of the Moral Law? therefore by this neceſſity of Repentance, he acknowledgeth, (and ſo do we) that by ſuch ſins, he was excluded from all hope of being Juſtified. Now it were abſurd, for a man to ſay that any thing excludes a man from being capable of receiving the promiſes of a Covenant, but only the breaking of the conditions thereof.

36. The third part of Evangelical Righteouſneſs is, *Faith*, not Moral, but Chriſtian; which is, A relying upon Chriſt, as the only meritorious cauſe of whatſoever benefit we obtain by the new Covenant; It being for his ſake, both that God beſtowes upon us grace, whereby we are enabled to perform his will; and after we have done our duty, that he will freely, and not as wages, beſtow upon us the reward thereof. There is another virtue Evangelical, which is Hope, but of that I muſt ſpeak in my laſt point. And thus I have gone through the Conditions required on mans part in the New Covenant, all which I ſuppoſe are implyed in this word *Faith*: which being taken in ſo general a ſenſe, may, I conceive, be thus not improperly defined, *viz.* To be a receiving and embracing of the Promiſes made unto us in Chriſt, upon the terms and conditions propoſed in the Goſpel.

37. Now follow the conditions on Gods part, comprehended in theſe words: The hope of Righteouſneſs, which are equivalent to the term of Juſtification: the nature whereof, I ſhall now endeavour to diſcover. Juſtification, I ſuppoſe, imports the whole Treaſure of bleſſings and favours, which God, who is rich in mercy, will freely beſtow on thoſe whom he accepts as Righteous for his beloved Son our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt his ſake; which are firſt, Remiſſion of ſins, and an intereſt unto the Joyes of heaven in this life, and a full conſummation both of Grace and Glory in the life to come. Some I know, think that S. *Paul* when he diſcourſes of Juſtification, thereby intends only Remiſſion of ſins: And the ground of this opinion is taken from S. *Paul* quoting thoſe words of *David*, when he ſtates the Doctrine of Juſtification, *Rom.* 4. 6, 7, 8. where he ſaith that *David deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works, ſaying, Bleſſed are they whoſe unrighteouſneſs is forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered; Bleſſed is the man unto whom the Lord will not impute ſin.* But if this Argument out of the Epiſtle to the *Romans* be of ſufficient force for their ſenſe of Juſtification; Then certainly an Argument from as expreſs words in the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, will be as concluding for mine (in which Epiſtle he alſo purpoſely ſtates the ſame queſtions). The words are *Gal.* 3. 11. *That no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, it is evident, for the Juſt ſhall live by faith.* Now, *to live*, I hope, does not ſignifie, to have ones ſins forgiven him, but to be Saved: Therefore, unleſs S. *Paul* include a right unto Salvation within the compaſs of Juſtification, that Text might have been ſpared, as nothing at all ſerving for his purpoſe.

Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8.

Gal. 3. 11.

Beſides,

Beſides, Is not Salvation, as free, as gracious, as undeſerved an act of God, as Remiſſion of ſins? Is it not as much for Chriſts ſake that we are ſaved, as that our ſins are forgiven us? Thus much for what I ſuppoſe is meant by Juſtification. I will now as briefly and as perſpicuouſly as I can (without uſing Allegories and Metaphorical expreſſions, with which this point is ordinarily much obſcured) ſhew you the combination of theſe two words, in what ſenſe I ſuppoſe S. *Paul* may uſe this propoſition; *We are Juſtified by Faith, without the Works of the Law.*

38. In the firſt place therefore I will lay down this Concluſion as an infallible ſafe foundation, That if we have reſpect to the proper meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, we muſt not take Faith, in that Propoſition, for any virtue or Grace inherent in us, but only for the proper and principal object thereof, Jeſus Chriſt and his Merits. And the meaning of that Propoſition muſt be, that we are not juſtified for the merits of any Righteouſneſs in our ſelves, whether Legal or Evangelical, but only for the Obedience and Death of our Bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. Though this be moſt true, yet I ſuppoſe that S. *Paul* in that propoſition, had not a reſpect to the Meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification; but to that Formal Condition required in us before we be Juſtified: as I think may appear by that which follows.

39. I told you even now, that I would in this point purpoſely abſtain from uſing Metaphors, and Figurative Alluſions; and the reaſon is, becauſe, I ſuppoſe, and not without reaſonable grounds, that the ſtating of this point of Juſtification by Metaphors, has made this Doctrine, which is ſet down with greater light and perſpicuity in holy Scripture, than almoſt any other, to be a Doctrine of the moſt Scholaſtical ſubtilty, the fulleſt of ſhadows and clouds of all the reſt. For example: In that faſhion and dreſs of Divinity, as it is now worn ſlic'd, and mangled into Theſes and Diſtinctions, we find this point of our Juſtification thus expreſs'd: That Faith is therefore ſaid to Juſtifie us, becauſe it is that which makes Chriſts righteouſneſs ours: it is as it were an inſtrument or hand, whereby we receive, lay hold on, and apply Chriſt unto our ſelves. Here's nought but flowers of Rhetorick, Figures, and Metaphors; which though they are capable of a good ſenſe, yet are very improper to ſtate a Controverſie withall.

40. But let us examine them a little: We muſt not ſay, they conceive of Faith, as if it were a Vertue or Grace, or any part of Righteouſneſs inherent in us: For Faith as a Grace has no influence at all into our Juſtification. Mark the Coherence of theſe things: Faith is conſidered as an hand or an inſtrument in our Juſtification, and yet, for all it is a Hand, it is nothing in, or of, us; for it ſeems, Hands are not parts of mens bodies. Again, Faith puts on Chriſt, receives him, layes hold upon him, makes his righteouſneſs ours, and yet it does nothing for all that. Beſides, How can Faith be properly call'd an inſtrument of Juſtification? An Inſtrument is that which the principal Cauſe the Efficient makes uſe of in his operation. Now Juſtification in this ſenſe, is an immanent internal action of God, in which there is no co-operation of any other agent, nor any real alteration wrought in man, the object thereof. Does God then uſe Faith as an inſtrument, in producing the Act of Juſtification? No, but

it

it is *Instrumentum Passivum*, saith one; That is a thing never heard of in nature before, and the meaning is sure, Faith, certainly, is something, but what a kind of thing, we know not. By these means it comes to pass, that the Doctrine of our Justification, as some men have handled it, is become as deep, as unsearchable a mystery, as that of the Trinity.

41. Without question, there is nothing can be more evident to a man, that shall unpartially consider S. *Paul's* method in his discourse of Justification, then that by Faith he intends some operative working grace in us: For instance, The Apostle proves that we Christians are to seek for Justification the same way that *Abraham* attained unto it, namely by Faith; for, saith the Scripture in his quotation, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.* What was that which was accounted to him? His believing; That is, say some, Christ who was the object of his Belief: This is a forc'd interpretation certainly, and which a Jew would never have been perswaded to. But that Christ was not at all intended in that place, it is evident; for *Abraham*'s belief there, had respect to Gods promise made to him of giving him a Son in his old age, and by that Son, a Seed as innumerable as the stars in heaven, as appears *Gen.* 15. 4, 5, 6. whereas the Promise of Christ, follows three Chapters after, to wit, *Gen.* 18. 18. Again, the Apostle in many places, useth these words, *We are Justified by Faith in Christ*, and *by the Faith of Jesus Christ*; which speeches of his, will admit of no tolerable sense, unless by Faith he intends some work or obedience perform'd by us. This therefore being taken for granted, that by Faith, is meant some condition required at our hands, (and yet my former conclusion of our Justification only for the merits of Christ remaining firm): we will in the next place consider what kind of obedience that of Faith is, and in what sense it may be said to justifie us.

Gen. 15. 4, 5, 6. Gen. 18. 18.

42. What satisfaction I conceive may be given to this Quæry, I will set down in this Assertion: That since Justification, even as it includes Remission of sins, is that Promise, to perform which unto us, God has oblig'd himself in the New Covenant; it must necessarily presuppose in the person to be so justified, such an obedience as the Gospel requires; namely first, Repentance from dead works, a conversion to a new obedience of those holy Moral Commands which are ratifi'd in the Gospel, and a relying upon Christ as the only meritorious cause of our Justification and Salvation, by a particular Evangelical Faith. All this, I say, is pre-required in the person who is made capable of Justification, either in the exercise, or at least *in præparatione cordis*, in a full resolution of the heart, and entire disposition of the mind: So that, though God be the sole proper Efficient Cause; and Christ, as Mediatour, the sole proper Meritorious Cause of our Justification: yet these inherent dispositions, are exacted on our part, as *causæ sine quibus non*, as necessary conditions to be found in us, before God will perform this great work, freely, and graciously towards us, and only for the Merits of Christ.

Assertion.

43. This Assertion may, I suppose, be demonstrated first from the nature of a Covenant: For, unless there be pre-required conditions on man's part to be perform'd, before God will proportion his reward; the very nature of a Covenant is destroy'd. And it will not boot to answer,

Reas. 1.

that

that though there be no qualifications required in a man, before he obtain Remiſſion of ſins, yet they are to be found in us before we be made capable of Salvation. For, as I have ſhew'd before, Salvation is as properly a gracious Act of Mercy, as free and undeſerved a gift, as truly beſtowed on us only for the Merits of Chriſt, as Remiſſion of ſins; and therefore may as well conſiſt without any change in us as the former. *Sol.* 1.

And ſecondly, If that propoſition of S. *Paul*, *We are Juſtified by Faith, without the works of the Law*, exclude all conditions to be perform'd by man; If it exclude not only the righteouſneſs of the Law (which indeed it doth) but the obedience of Faith, or the Goſpel likewiſe, from being neceſſary diſpoſitions in us before we receive remiſſion of ſins; Then another ſaying of his, parallel to this, will exclude as well the neceſſity of an Evangelical Obedience to our ſalvation: For, ſaith S. *Paul*, *Eph.* 2. 8. *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God: not of Works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt.* But I hope no man will be ſo unchriſtian-like, as to exclude the neceſſity of our good works to ſalvation, for all this ſaying of S. *Paul*; therefore, they may as well be pre-required to Remiſſion of ſins, notwithſtanding the former place. *Sol.* 2. Eph. 2. 8.

44. Secondly, If there be no neceſſity of any pre-diſpoſition in us before Remiſſion of ſins; then a man may have his ſins forgiven him, and ſo become a perſon accepted of God, whileſt he is a perſon unregenerate, unſanctified, whileſt he is *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*, whileſt he *walks according to the courſe of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that worketh in the children of diſobedience*; whileſt he *has his converſation in the luſts of the fleſh, fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh, and of the mind*, being, notwithſtanding his Juſtification, *a child of wrath*, as much as the profaneſt heathen, though the verieſt reprobate in the world; laſtly, though he be no child of *Abraham* according to faith, that is, not having in him that faith which was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs. Now whether this Divinity be conſonant to Gods Word, let your own conſciences be Judges. *Reaſ.* 2. Eph. 2. 1, &c.

45. A third Argument to prove the Truth of the former Aſſertion, ſhall be taken from ſeveral Texts of Scripture; where Juſtification, even as it is taken for Remiſſion of ſins, is aſcribed to other virtues beſides Faith, (whether it be taken for a particular virtue, or for the object thereof). For example, Our Saviour ſaith expreſly, *By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt be condemned*: where we ſee, Juſtification is taken in that proper ſenſe, in which we maintain it againſt the Papiſts. Again, *If you forgive men their treſpaſſes, your heavenly Father will alſo forgive you*; *But if you forgive not men their treſpaſſes, neither will your Father forgive your treſpaſſes.* Again, our Saviour ſpeaking concerning *Mary*, ſaith, *Her ſins are forgiven her, becauſe ſhe loved much.* If the time, or your patience, could ſuffer me, I might add a fourth Reaſon to prove my former Aſſertion, which is the clearneſs and evidence of agreement and reconciliation between S. *Paul*, and S. *James* in this point upon theſe grounds, without any new invented Juſtification before men, which is a conceit taken up by ſome men, only to ſhift off an Adverſary's argument, which otherwiſe would preſs them too hard, they think: for, S. *Paul*'s Faith, taken for the obedience of the Goſpel, would eaſily *Reaſ.* 3. Mat. 12. 37. Mat. 6. 14, 15. Luk. 7. 47. *Reaſ.* 4.

Jam. 1. 27. eaſily accord with S. *James* his *holy and undefiled Religion before God*, or works which is all one; And S. *James* would be S. *Paul*'s expoſitour without any injury or detraction at all from the merits of Chriſt, or Gods free and undeſerved mercy to us in him. But I muſt haſten.

46. The full meaning, then, of S. *Paul*'s Propoſition, *We are juſtified by Faith, and not by the works of the Law:* and by conſequence, the ſtate of the whole controverſie of Juſtification, in brief, may be this; That if we conſider the efficient cauſe of our Juſtification, it is only God which Juſtifies: if that for which we are juſtified, that is, the meritorious cauſe thereof, it is not for any thing in our ſelves, but only for the obedience and ſatisfaction of our Bleſſed Saviour, that God will Juſtifie us: But if we have reſpect to what kind of Conditions are to be found in us, before Chriſt will ſuffer us to be made partakers of the benefit of his Merits, then we muſt ſay, that we are not juſtified by ſuch a Righteouſneſs, ſo perfect, abſolute, and complete, as the Law of Works does require; but by the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, by a Righteouſneſs proportionable to that Grace which God is pleaſed to beſtow on us; not by the perfection, but ſincerity of our obedience to the New Covenant. And the Apoſtle's main argument will ſerve to prove this to any underſtanding, moſt undeniably. S. *Paul* has demonſtrated, that if we conſider the rigour of the Law, all men, both Jews and Gentiles are concluded under ſin, and moſt neceſſarily obnoxious to Gods wrath. Which Reaſon of his, would not be at all prevailing, unleſs by works of the Law, he intended only ſuch a perfect obedience as the Law requires; which by reaſon of mans weakneſs, is become impoſſible unto him. For it might eaſily be reply'd upon him thus: We confeſs, no man can fulfil the Law; but the conditions of the Goſpel are not only poſſible, but, by the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, eaſie to be performed; ſo that though, for this reaſon, the former Righteouſneſs be excluded from our Juſtification, not only *quoad meritum*, but alſo, *quoad præſentiam*; yet the later Evangelical Righteouſneſs is excluded from our Juſtification, only *quoad Meritum*.

47. But I perceive an Objection ready to aſſault me; and I will impartially aſſiſt the force and ſtrength thereof againſt my ſelf, with all the advantage I can. It is to this purpoſe: When men are diſputing in the Schools, or diſcourſing in the Pulpit, they may ſtate this queſtion as they pleaſe: But the fitteſt time to decide this point, is, when, in a ſerious contemplation, we preſent before our eyes Almighty God, the righteous impartial Judge of heaven and earth, ſitting in his Throne, ready to execute Judgement, and our ſelves arraigned at the Barr before him, expecting a final irreverſible ſentence. In theſe circumſtances, I would fain ſee the ſtouteſt-hearted man alive, that ſhould dare to ſay unto Almighty God, Thou haſt given me a Law, which my conſcience witneſſeth unto me, that I have perform'd. Therefore I now challenge thee upon thy Truth and Faithfulneſs, that thou perform thy conditions alſo with me, and give me Remiſſion of my former ſins, as a Reward of my obedience.

48. For

48. For anſwer to this Objection: This is confeſſed by all Chriſtians of all Religions, that a Profane perſon, or an Hypocrite dying in ſuch an eſtate, ſhall neither in the laſt day be acquitted of his ſins, nor ſaved: Therefore unleſs a mans heart can witneſs unto him, that he hath unfeignedly kept Gods Commandements, *God, who is greater than his heart, and knoweth all things*, will aſſuredly condemn him: But then we muſt know, that it is not a Chriſtians plea, to relie upon his own, though ſincere unhypocritical Righteouſneſs, and therefore to challenge heaven. But as our Saviour adviſeth us, *We when we have done all we can, muſt ſay, We are unprofitable ſervants*: And not ſay ſo in a complement only, but in the truth and ſincerity of our hearts. It is the perfection of Evangelical Righteouſneſs, to deny our own righteouſneſs, to diſclaim all meritorious efficacy thereof, either in Remiſſion of ſins, or Salvation. Therefore, he that after he hath perform'd Gods Commandements, ſhall think to challenge the reward as of debt, or as promiſed only to his own holineſs, wants the proper peculiar righteouſneſs of a Chriſtian; He muſt ſay in holy *Job*'s words, *Though I were righteous, yet would I not anſwer God, but I will make ſupplication to my Judge:* I would ſay unto him, Lord look not upon that holineſs which is in me, which yet is not mine neither, for thou wrought'ſt it in me; But look on him in whom only thou art well pleaſed; Accept of me in him, and for his ſake only, who hath fulfill'd all righteouſneſs for me, who through the eternal Spirit, hath offered himſelf without ſpot unto thee, being made ſin and a curſe for me, that I might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him. To him only be glory for ever and ever. The ſum of all which I have ſaid, is contain'd *Tit.* 2. 11,--14. *The Grace of God which bringeth*, &c. And ſo I come to the 2d General, namely, the Promiſe which God will make good unto us who ſincerely obey him, contain'd in theſe words, *We wait for the Hope*, &c.

Sol. 1 Joh. 3. c. 20. Luke 17. 10. Job 9. 15.

49. Which General I divided into two Particulars: 1. The nature of the reward promiſed, which I told you was, Juſtification containing Remiſſion of Sins, and everlaſting Life. 2. The intereſt, which, during this life, we ordinarily have in that reward, namely Hope, expreſſed in theſe words, *We wait for the Hope of Righteouſneſs*: that is, by hope we expect the reward of righteouſneſs. I cannot now enlarge my ſelf in the former particular, ſomething I have already been forc'd to ſay of it, which muſt ſuffice: I will in few words conſider the ſecond Particular, namely the intereſt which we have in the Promiſes, which is Hope: *We wait for*, &c.

50. I know nothing more effectual to perſwade me, to ſearch for and embrace Divine Truth with ſingleneſs of heart and without reſpect of perſons, then to conſider, that there are no opinions ſo unreaſonable, ſo directly contradictory to one another, but the Spirit of contradiction and partiality will make a man eaſily to ſwallow and digeſt them. As for example, whereas the Papiſts moſt preſumptuouſly maintain, that it is in a mans power, by the ordinary aſſiſtance of Grace, ſo exactly to perform all Gods Commandements, that he ſhall have no need to ſay, *Lord forgive us our treſpaſſes*; Some of their

their adverſaries ſtrive ſo much to avoid this Aſſertion on the contrary extream, that they will not allow, even the beſt and moſt holy Actions of the moſt Regenerate man, to be ſuch as God requires at our hands; they will not only have them to be imperfect, but ſinful, I, if ſtrictly examined, ſins. And yet for all this, thoſe who put it in a mans power to fulfil all Gods Commandements, will not ſuffer any man to have any certainty of their Salvation: On the contrary, the others, though they make a mans beſt actions to be ſins, yet require at his hands an infallible divine Faith of his Salvation, not only as an attendant, but as the very nature and eſſence of that Faith, whereby he ſhall be Juſtified.

51. It may be poſſible, that one of theſe parties might light upon the truth, if either of them would be willing to change one of his opinions with his adverſary: but, as they have been pleaſed to yoke ſuch jarring poſitions together, I am confidently perſwaded, that both of them have miſſ'd of the truth, and left it in the middle to any third perſon that will be willing to ſtand neuter in a mean betwixt them both. I will not now examine how farr each ſide have out-run the truth contrary waies: only as I am required by that part of my Text which remains, I will lay down two Aſſertions participating, in ſome
1. meaſure, of both opinions; The firſt whereof is this (which I have already touch'd) That no man can juſtly and reaſonably expect or hope for the reward of righteouſneſs, but he whoſe heart and conſcience can unfeignedly witneſs unto him, that he hath, though not exactly, yet ſincerely, and without Hypocriſie, perform'd the conditions of the
2. New Covenant. The ſecond, That the intereſt which ſuch a perſon ordinarily hath in the Promiſes, is only Hope.

Aſſert. 1. 52. Now concerning the 1. Aſſertion, namely, That no man can juſtly, *&c.* I would not now be miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that before a man can hope for ſalvation, he muſt perform Gods Commandements exactly, but only according to the equity of the Goſpel; according to that famous ſaying of S. *Auguſtine, Retract. l.* 1. *c.* 19. *Omnia mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit ignoſcitur.* Now, that a man may keep Gods Commandements, as far as the Equity of the Goſpel expects from him, may, I think, be thus demonſtrated: There is no man that hears me this day, I am perſwaded, but he does often ſeriouſly deſire of God, that he would give him the Grace to do his will: Now, all prayer, if it be right, is to be perform'd in Faith, *i. e.* with a full perſwaſion, not only that it is lawful, and warrantable, for him to deſire that which he prays for, but alſo with as full a perſwaſion, that Almighty God is not only able, but ready and willing alſo to grant him his petitions; otherwiſe, it is not only a vain, but a ſinful prayer; it is a tempting of God, as if he ſhould deſire him to do that, which he knows is impoſſible. Beſides, can we think that God would command us (and withall add a promiſe of hearing and granting our petitions) would he, I ſay, command us to pray for that which we are aſſured of before hand, cannot, and muſt not, be granted? Therefore certainly, ſome Chriſtians have been heard in theſe petitions; ſome men

men have been found, who have fulfilled the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel.

53. Now till thou haſt done this, which thou ſeeſt by the aſſiſtance of God's Spirit, (which will never be wanting to them which deſire it) it is poſſible for thee to do; nay, I will add further, is eaſie for thee to do: Doth not Chriſt ſay as much? *My yoak is eaſie, and my burthen is light.* I ſay, till thou haſt done this, thou canſt have no reaſon in the world to hope for Gods mercy. For tell me! why doſt thou hope, thou that continueſt ſtill in an unrepentant eſtate, in an habitual oppoſition to God's holy Commandements? Art thou reſolved to hope, becauſe thou haſt a mind to it, upon no ground? when thou oughteſt rather to fear, almoſt to deſpair? Or rather, canſt thou perſwade thy ſelf in earneſt, that this is indeed a hope? Is it not a fancy of thine own brain, or rather a Temptation of the Devil? *Hope, which is hope indeed,* which is not a fancy and Chimera, *makes not aſhamed*, ſaith *S. Paul*: A man may with confidence, without confuſion of face, profeſs and maintain it. But ſuch a hope as this is, which is not a hope in earneſt, how will it diſgrace a man, and put him out of countenance, when God ſhall ask him why he did offer to hope? Rom. 5. 5.

54. Let thy conſcience now anſwer me, whoſoever thou art, in ſuch a ſtate. Thou that knoweſt how often God hath ſaid, nay, ſworn in his wrath, that none of thoſe which continue diſobedient, ſhall enter into his reſt! That none ſhall be partakers of the ſecond Reſurrection unto Glory, but thoſe that have been partakers of the firſt unto Grace! Canſt thou for all this, imagine, that God has ſuch a peculiar-particular affection and reſpect to thee, who art yet a ſlave of the Devils; that he will be content to ſtrain his Truth and veracity, to break his Oath for thy company? Shall the whole Scripture, which promiſes glory to none but thoſe who perform the conditions preſcribed, for thy ſake be turned into a Romance, into a melancholy Tale to fright children withall? No, no, Aſſure thy ſelf, it is not a conceit of Election which will ſave thee: thou muſt work, and work hard, in fear and trembling, before God will raiſe in thee the good Spirit of Chriſtian Hope.

55. For to ſay the truth of all Divine Graces, Hope is incomparably the hardeſt to attain unto: And the reaſon is evident, becauſe it pre-ſuppoſes the poſſeſſion of all other Graces before it. And yet for all this, nothing counted ſo eaſie, now a daies, as Hope, though men both are and reſolve to be never ſo wicked: Nay, and it is well if Hope will ſerve their turn, they muſt have an infallible aſſurance, a Divine Faith of everlaſting glory; And no manner of ſins, though never ſo heinous, never ſo oft committed, ſhall be able to weaken this their aſſurance, that they are reſolved of. This they think is a ſpell ſtrong enough for the Devil in all aſſails; when God knows, the Devil is more joy'd and comforted, to ſee them ſo vainly delude themſelves, then they themſelves poſsibly can be. This for my firſt Aſſertion; now follows the ſecond.

Assert. 2. 56. When I say, that the Interest which a Christian ordinarily has in the Promises of God, is *Hope*; I mean, it is not absolute and irrespective, but depending upon conditions, namely, Grace, and perseverance therein. And this I took for granted, for I never heard of any yet, that denyed perseverance to be necessary to salvation. If then his Interest be by Hope, then it is not yet by Faith, properly so called; For it is not possible, that the same object (considered with the same circumstances at the same time) should be the object both of Faith and Hope. For example: I believe by a Divine Faith, *i. e.* a Faith grounded upon God's Word, that there shall be a Resurrection of the Flesh, even of this flesh of mine; And I believe it firmly, because God hath said that he will bring it to pass; neither is there any condition of mine pre-required to the performance of this promise of God; for howsoever I behave my self here in this world, whether well or ill, it matters not, my behaviour cannot make God alter his resolution. Now, if I assuredly believe this, it would be improper and absurd, for me to say, I hope there will be a Resurrection of my body; for when I say, I hope any thing, I imply a possibility, in nature, that such a thing may not be, which in this case I cannot do without infidelity.

57. But, on the other side, I hope that God will raise this flesh of mine unto Glory, and I hope this upon safe grounds: Therefore, if it be true that I hope it, I cannot properly be said to believe it, because my salvation yet depends upon conditions; namely, perseverance. Therefore let me propose this one question to any mans conscience: Hast thou such an assurance of salvation given thee of God, that Hope is quite evacuated in thee: Is there no such virtue left in thee as Hope? Surely God hath dealt extraordinarily mercifully with thee; Thou art many degrees gone beyond the state of those believers which S. *Paul* speaks of, and includes himself in the number, when he saith, *We live by Hope:* For thou doest not live by Hope, thou art exalted above it. Notwithstanding, I beseech you, consider well upon the matter, (for it concerns you very much) be not too hasty to credit fancies, when conceits of assurance or impeccability shall be suggested to your minds. There may be great danger of a confidence ungrounded; a confidence only taken upon trust, from other mens words or opinions.

58. Do I go about (now think you) to bereave you, or couzen you of any spiritual comfort in this life? Do I envy any of you your assurance? Alas, why should I deal so with you? for I was never injur'd by you; or, if I were, surely, of all places, I would not make choice of this to execute my Revenge in. Or if I thought that such an assurance were ordinarily to be had, at least necessary, to the making up of a Justifying Faith, (and have you never heard it said so?) would I not (think you) strive and endeavour to obtain it at any rate, even with the loss of all worldly comforts? Yes certainly, I would count them all but as dross and dung in comparison of it: But I confess unto you I am yet contented

contented with enjoying Heaven by Hope: And I bleſs Almighty God, that he has dealt ſo graciouſly with me, that I ſhould dare to hope for it, and not be ſhamed and confounded by my hope. And if there be any amongſt you, that will vouchſafe to content himſelf with ſuch a neglected degree of comfort, with only hope, and no more, I will not enter into compariſon with thoſe that are perfect; but I dare promiſe him, that all thoſe troubleſome pleaſures, which do ſo raviſh the men of this world, ſhall be as nothing; yea, as afflictions and torments, in compariſon of thoſe ſpiritual heavenly Joyes, which Hope, well and legally atchieved, will be able to afford us: No dangers will there be of terrours or jealouſies, as if God would happen to grow weary, or repent himſelf of any grace or bleſſing which he hath beſtowed upon us.

59. For, tell me; Do you think that *Adam*, while he continued in his Innocency, had any grudgings of ſuſpicions or fears? Was he not, during that time, in as great a quiet and ſerenity of mind, as any of us dare hope for? And yet the moſt that he could do then, was to hope that he might continue in that ſtate even to the end: The event ſhews, he could not have an infallible Faith of his perſeverance. If then ſuch a contented ſetled mind could accompany *Adam* in Paradiſe, even when he knew it was in his power, with but reaching out his hand, and taſting an Apple; yea, with a ſudden wicked word, or an unſanctified thought, utterly, and irrecoverably to degrade himſelf from that happy eſtate; ſurely, we Chriſtians have much more reaſon to rejoyce in our hope, ſince we know aſſuredly, that as God has been ſo gracious to begin this good work in us, ſo he will not be wanting to perfect it even to the end, if we will but perform our parts, which he has already given us more then ſufficient grace to do, and will never fail to ſupply us with more, for the asking: nay, more, which are ſurer grounds to build upon than ever *Adam* had; ſince we know, that not one, nor ten, nor a hundred ſins, ſhall be able ſo irreparably to caſt us out of God's favour, but that he will be willing upon our Repentance, eſpecially calling to mind his old mercies, to reſtore us again to our loſt happineſs.

60. Neither are we utterly excluded from all aſſurance; for there is a πληροφορία, *a full aſſurance of Hope*, ſaith S. *Paul*, *Heb.* 6. 11. *This Hope we have as a ſure Anchor of the ſoul* faſtned on a Rock: The Rock cannot fail us, the Anchor will not; all the danger is in the Cable or chain of ſpiritual Graces, whereby we are faſtned to this Rock: If this chain but hold, no tempeſt, no winds, no flouds can endanger us. And part of our Hope reſpects this chain; for God has promis'd his willingneſs and readineſs to ſtrengthen it every day more and more, till our ſtate ſhall be ſo chang'd, that there ſhall be no ſuch things as Tempeſts known, no toſſings of waves, no tumults of winds, nor fear of leaking or decay in the Veſſel, but all calmneſs and ſecurity. And for the attaining to this happy unchangeable eſtate, where is it that we place our Hope? Truly

Heb. 6. 11. *Ibid.* 9.

our Hope is even in thee, O God; who, if thou ſhalt think it convenient or neceſſary for us, wilt enlarge this our Hope into confidence, and add, unto that, aſſurance, and ſwallow up all in poſſeſſion; And that not for any merits of ours, but only for thy free undeſerved Mercies in our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, *in whom alone thou art well pleaſed*; To whom, with thee O Father, and the bleſſed Spirit, be aſcribed by us, and thy whole Church, the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever, *Amen.*

The

The Ninth Sermon.

1 Cor. X. 13.

——*God is Faithful who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.*——

WHatever puniſhments befel the diſobedient *Iſraelites*, who murmured and tempted God in the Wilderneſs, Verſ. 6. *They all happened unto them* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *for enſamples to us, and are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.* Verſ. 11. This Priviledge we may have beyond our fore-fathers, that we may preſent before our eyes a larger Series and Hiſtory of God's Providence, even ſince the foundation of the World: We may take a view and proſpect of his conſtant unaltered courſe of revenging himſelf upon ſin, in whatſoever perſons he finds it; And we ought from thence to collect, that whatſoever immunities and priviledges we may conceive to our ſelves, whatſoever comfortable Errors we may take up upon truſt, yet that God will (not for our ſakes) begin a new frame of Policy in the Adminiſtration of the World; but that we alſo, unleſs we break off our ſins by repentance, and converſion unto God, We, I ſay, after the example of theſe murmuring *Iſraelites*, as thoſe upon whom the Tower of *Siloe* fell, as thoſe fourteen, whoſe bloud *Pilate* mingled with the Sacrifices, that *we alſo unleſs we repent, ſhall all likewiſe periſh*. Nay certainly, we (upon whom the ends of the world are come) ſhall be much more culpable, our puniſhment and ſtripes ſhall be more in number and weightier, if we (notwithſtanding that larger experience which we may have of Gods unpartial dealing with ſinners) ſhall yet promiſe to our ſelves impunity, *If we ſhall ſay, we ſhall have peace, though we walk in the imaginations of our hearts.*

2. The ſame collection we may proportionably make to our own benefit and advantage, from Gods gracious dealing and behaviour to any of his beloved faithful ſervants, we may appropriate to our ſelves, all thoſe bleſſings and promiſes which have been afforded unto them, If our Conſciences can aſſure us, that we do obey Gods Commandements in the truth

and ſincerity of our hearts. Now for warrant to this kind of collection, inſtead of ſeveral examples in Holy Scripture, I will only make uſe of one
Heb. 13. 5. taken out of (I think) this our Apoſtle, where he ſaith, *Let your converſation be without covetouſneſs, and be content with ſuch things as you have; For God hath ſaid, I will never leave thee, nor forſake thee.* Which words by him quoted, as the margins of our Bibles will direct us, are to be found
Joſh. 1. 5. *Joſh.* 1. 5. Which, though they be a particular Promiſe which God immediately made to *Joſhua*, thereby to encourage him after the death of *Moſes*, to take upon him the conducting of the *Jews* into the Land of Promiſe, aſſuring unto him a continuation of his extraordinary aſſiſtance in the enterpriſe: Yet notwithſtanding, St. *Paul*, we ſee (as if God had proclaim'd this Promiſe to the whole world) applyes theſe words to all the Faithful among the *Hebrews*, and by the ſame proportion to all Chriſtians likewiſe.

3. Upon which grounds I may as reaſonably direct the words of this verſe, out of which my Text is taken, to you that now hear me, as the Apoſtle does to the *Corinthians*, And ſay, *There hath no temptation taken you, but ſuch as is common to man:* For certainly, we will not imagine, that the Church or City of *Corinth* had any ſuch extraordinary Immunity or Charter granted them, whereby they ſhould be exempted from the danger of Temptations above all the Chriſtian world beſides. Therefore let your memories recollect and examin the time paſt of your lives, and tell me, Did there ever any Temptation take hold of you, or aſſault you ſo powerful and irreſiſtable, that there was no way left for you but to be overcome by it? (Take Temptation now in what ſenſe you pleaſe, either for a misfortune and Affliction, or elſe for a Suggeſtion to ſin.) Was there ever any calamity, any loſs, any pain, any ſickneſs, ſo violent and impetuous, but that ſtill you might perceive your ſelves notwithſtanding (though perhaps in your outward man unequally match't by it) yet in your ſpirits and minds ſtrong enough to conquer the malice thereof, and to convert it into wholeſome Phyſick? Again, Was there ever any ſinful Temptation ſo ſtrongly urg'd upon you, but that you might by the aſſiſtance of that Grace which God had already given you, or at the leaſt, for the asking, would have ſuper-added, you might eaſily have dull'd and diverted the force thereof? Did not your Conſciences, even after you were overcome by ſuch a Temptation, tell you, that it was meer voluntary cowardize in you, to ſuffer your ſelves to be overcome by it, that you willingly ſurrendred and betray'd thoſe forces which already God had given you?

4. Now, though I am perſwaded this be ſo evidently true, that there is ſcarce any one here but his Conſcience will aſſure him as much; Yet, for all this, we muſt not begin hereupon to fancy in our minds any extraordinary worth or dignity in our ſelves, as though by our own power or holineſs we could work ſuch wonders. No alas, nothing leſs: For take away the aſſiſtance and guard of our Auxiliary Forces, God's free and undeſerved Graces within us, and his Divine aſſiſtance, together with the Guard of his bleſſed Angels without us, and there is no Temptation ſo weak and deſpicable, which we ſhould not ſuddenly yield unto; Nay, we ſhould need no outward Tempters to help us to ſin, our own wicked hearts would ſave the Devil that labour; For nothing is there ſo vile and abominable, whereunto without God's reſtraining Grace we ſhould not readily and impetuouſly haſten unto.

5. There-

5. Therefore let us neither defraud God nor our ſelves of their dues: But as we have ſpoken of the time paſt, ſo likewiſe of that which follows, If hereafter we ſhall overcome any temptation (as certainly, by Gods help, if we have but a mind to it, we may) Let us bleſs Almighty God for aſſiſting us ſo farr, let us give the glory and Trophies of the conqueſt to him: But on the contrary ſide, if we ſhall neglect to make uſe and advantage of thoſe many helps againſt ſin, which Almighty God is ready to ſupply unto us: If notwithſtanding thoſe many Promiſes of aſſiſtance ſo frequently ſet down in Holy Scripture; If notwithſtanding thoſe many ſecret whiſperings and inſpirations of his Holy Spirit in our ſouls: If notwithſtanding God's Voyce, which (as every day's experience can witneſs unto us) continually calls upon us, ſaying, *This is the right way, walk in it, and ye ſhall find reſt to your ſouls*; we will yet continue to extinguiſh thoſe good motions, to deafen and drown God's voyce, and be ready to hearken unto, and obey our own filthy luſts and vile affections: Let us lay the fault where it is due, even upon our own deceitful wicked Hearts; or otherwiſe, the time will come when in Hell we ſhall be evidently convinc'd thereof, when the worm of Conſcience which never dyeth ſhall continually torment and gnaw us. Let God be true and faithful in his Promiſes, and every man a Lyar. For, as hitherto God has been ſo merciful to you to preſerve you, that no temptation ſhould take you, but ſuch as is common to man; ſo likewiſe for the time following, though perhaps greater tryals may befal you, than hitherto you have had experience of, yet of this you may be confident, that howſoever they may ſeem grievous; yet the ſame God continues faithful and righteous to fulfil his Promiſes, *He will never ſuffer you to be tempted above that you are able.*

6. Temptation is a thing of its own Nature indifferent, and is rendred good or evil, from the end and intention of the Tempter eſpecially: It is nothing elſe but making a tryal or experiment. If good; an aſſay, whether that good which ſeems to be in a ſubject be true and firmly grounded, or no: So God may be ſaid to tempt, as he did *Abraham*, &c. And this he performs not to ſatisfie his curioſity, but meerly out of a good inclination to the party; both thereby to confirm his graces in him, and to reward them with a greater meaſure of Glory. If evil; Temptation is an aſſay, whether that good which ſeems to be in a man, may not by ſome means or other be extinguiſh'd, and ſo the perſon deſtroyed, ſo the Devil is moſt properly called the Tempter: And of this nature are the Temptations of my Text: Now theſe we find in Holy Scripture to be twofold: For either they are 1. apt to draw us from good by way of Diſcouragement; ſo all manner of afflictions, misfortunes, perſecutions, *&c.* are called Temptations, becauſe by theſe a man is inclinable to be frighted from, or at laſt diſcountenanced in a holy converſation: Or elſe they allure us by way of invitation or ſollici- 2. tation to evil; ſo wicked pleaſing ſuggeſtions are ſaid to be Temptations, becauſe theſe are fit to palliate the unlovelineſs and deformity of ſin, and thereby to make it deſirable unto us. It would be but loſs of time to heap together Examples of holy Scripture to make good this diſtinction; ſince it is an Argument which you daily meet withal diſcours'd of in Sermons.

7. But, I confeſs, I find it ſomething difficult to determin, whether of theſe two ſenſes, with excluſion of the other be intended by St. *Paul*, in my Text,

Text, whether, when he ſays, *God will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that ye are able*, his meaning ſhould be, God by his Wiſdom and Providence, will ſo contrive buſineſſes for you, that, though you are not likely to live in a contiual uninterrupted courſe of happineſs and ſecurity, but that ſometimes you ſhall daſh your foot againſt a ſtone, you ſhall be diſquieted and moleſted with afflictions of ſeveral natures; notwithſtanding, this you may be confident of, that let what misfortue will, come, how grievous and even inſupportable ſoever it may ſeem unto you, it ſhall never be ſo violent and out-ragious, but that God will provide a way for you to eſcape from it, there will be a dore left open for you to avoid the furiouſneſs and impetuouſneſs of it; either God will arm you with Patience to bear it, and then the comfort which your ſouls may feel, in the conſideration of what glorious rewards are promiſed unto your Patience, ſhall make your afflictions even matters of rejoycing unto you; in which reſpect, (as St. *James* ſaith) *you ought to count it all joy, when you fall into divers Temptations*, Or, if thoſe Temptations and Afflictions reach ſo farr as to the deſtroying of your Lives, yet notwithſtanding all this, they are ſo unable to make you miſerable, unleſs you will take part with them againſt your own ſouls, by repining and murmuring under the mighty hand of God, that when you ſhall conſider that bleſſed change which death ſhall bring unto you, when all tears ſhall be wiped from your eyes, all fear and expectation of miſery removed, nothing but inexpreſsable and everlaſting joys to be expected, you ſhall bleſs the time that ever you were afflicted, and with St. *Paul* confeſs, *That the afflictions of this life are worthy of that joy which ſhall be revealed.* This, I ſay, is a good Catholique, Orthodox ſenſe, and which it is very probable, that St. *Paul* might more directly intend in theſe words of my Text.

8. Notwithſtanding I cannot exclude the other ſenſe of the word *Temptation* from this Text; for according to the Analogy of Faith, and without any wrong done to the dependance and connexion of theſe words (*God will not ſuffer you to be tempted*, &c.) St. *Paul*'s intent in them might be ſuch, as if it had been thus ſpread out more at large, though conſidering the many diſadvantages we have in the way of godlineſs, in reſpect both of our powerful, malicions, induſtrious, and ſubtile Enemy the Devil, who continually waits upon us to entrap us; in reſpect of our ſeeming flattering friend, the world and vanities thereof alluring us; But eſpecially in reſpect of our own wicked and deceitful Hearts, forward and deſirous enough to embrace the wicked ſuggeſtions and temptations of both, nay, ſufficient to deſtroy us without the aſſiſtance of either: I ſay, that though (theſe things conſidered) we may ſeem to be ſet (in the expreſſion of the Holy Ghoſt) *upon ſlippery places*, where it is almoſt impoſſible for us to keep our footing, and to preſerve our ſelves from falling dangerouſly, and daſhing our ſelves in pieces.

9, Notwithſtanding, if our eyes were opened, as were the eyes of the Prophet *Eliſha*'s ſervant, we ſhould find as well as he, that they that be with us, are more than they that be againſt us: For God and his Holy Angels, who are on our ſide, are both wiſer and ſtronger than the Devil, and more willing to do us good, than the other can be to hurt us: Beſides, the expectation of thoſe gloriousrewards, which are laid up in Heaven for us, are ſufficient, even to any reaſonable man, to diſ-reliſh unto him the vain unſatisfying pleaſures of this world: And

though

though our own hearts naturally be never ſo traiterous and unfaithful; yet by the power of that Grace which is plentifully ſhowred down upon every one of us in our Baptiſm, and which is dayly encreaſed and ſupplyed unto us, they may eaſily be corrected and renewed. So, that if the ſuggeſtion of any wicked Temptation get the maſtery over us, let us not impute too much to the valour and ſtrength of our Enemies; let us not accuſe God of any unwillingneſs to ſuccour us; For never any Temptation hath or ever ſhall happen unto us, but ſuch as is ἀνθρώπινος, ſuitable unto the nature of man, ſuch as a reaſonable, conſiderate, and a circumſpect man, by the ordinary aſſiſtance of God's Grace, and careful application of thoſe means wherewith we are abundantly furniſhed out of Holy Scripture, as Prayer, Watchfulneſs, Faſting, and the like, may eaſily conquer and ſubdue.

10. This ſenſe of theſe words may with as good reaſon and probability be ſuppos'd to be intended by St. *Paul* in this place as the former: And indeed, unleſs we inlarge St. *Paul*'s words to this meaning alſo, we ſhall receive no extraordinary comfort and encouragement from them: For, though indeed, it is true, that it is more than we can deſerve at God's hands to obtain a Promiſe from him, to ſecure us, that no Temptations, no outward Afflictions of this world, ſhall be ſo violent and furious upon us, as to exceed the ſtrength of Reaſon and Grace to withſtand them; Yet, ſince Sin is that only Enemy which is able to withdraw God's favour from us, and make him our Enemy, unleſs we can be put in ſome hope, that there is a poſſible courſe for us to prevail againſt ſin alſo, and all the dangerous temptations and ſuggeſtions thereof, we ſhould live but an uncomfortable diſcontented life, we ſhould be continually affrighted with ſad melancholick thoughts, with diſquieting jealouſies and fears, that however we may now and then pleaſe our ſelves with conceits of Gods favour for the preſent, yet, ſince he has paſs'd no promiſe of ſecuring us for the future, it may happen, that ſuch a ſinful Temptation may come upon us, which may be able, do what we can, to over-whelm us irrecoverably. Therefore ſince this latter ſenſe (which I mentioned of theſe words) is more profitable and advantageous to us, I will eſpecially at this time inſiſt upon it, and labour to demonſtrate undeniably to every one of us, that *God is faithful*, and will aſſuredly make good that promiſe which he hath made unto us all, namely, *not to ſuffer us to be tempted*, that is, by any ſinful temptation, *above that we are able*.

11. Now, he is ſaid to be tempted above that he is able, who, do what he can, though he ſtrain his natural endowments to the uttermoſt, and though he endeavour heartily, to make uſe of all the outward helps and aſſiſtances which he finds preſcribed unto him out of Gods Word, though he extend that meaſure of Grace wherewith he is furniſhed to the extreameſt activity thereof to reſiſt ſuch a Temptation; yet, in the end is forced to yield to the power of it, utterly fainting and languiſhing in the combat. So, on the contrary, that man who being compleatly furniſh'd with all requiſite weapons both for his own defence, and encountring his Adverſary, and beſides, having in him both ability of body, and courage enough, and yet out of a ſleepy negligence, or obſtinate ſullenneſs, will not take the pains to lift up his arm, or otherways beſtir himſelf to oppoſe his Enemy, ſuch a man, if overcome, can in no reaſon be

ſaid

ſaid to be Over-match'd, but is a mere Traytour to his own ſafety and reputation.

12. And indeed, before I can proceed any further, I muſt either take this for granted, That ſome men though (*de facto*) they have been overcome by a Temptation, yet might have reſiſted it by the aſſiſtance of that Grace wherewith they were enabled, Or truly, I know not what to ſay: For, if this be a good inference, a man is overcome by a Temptation, therefore he could not poſſibly have reſiſted, *Adam*, for all he was ſeduc'd by the Devil, is not ſo culpable as I took him to be. How can I charge ſuch a man for not doing his duty? How can I convince his Conſcience, that it was his own fault and negligence, that he did not that which he ought and might have done? Is there no man then to be found, that could poſſibly have done no more good than actually he has done? Does every man improve that Talent of Grace which God has given him to the uttermoſt of his power and skill? Or will any of you, when you confeſs your ſins unto Almighty God, tell him to this purpoſe, Lord, I confeſs, I do daily fall into many and grievous ſins. But, ſince they are gone and paſt, I perceive there was no remedy for it, it could not be avoided, thoſe ſins muſt needs have been practis'd by me, I did whatſoever I was enabled to do; If I had had more ſtrength, I had done better; when thou beſtoweſt on me more Talents of Grace, I ſhall be a more profitable ſervant, and yield thee a greater intereſt and advantage by them. If any of you entertain ſuch conceits as theſe, I confeſs, you are a great deal more righteous than I thought you had been.

13. For mine own part, I confeſs with grief and ſhame, and ſelf-condemnation, that I have offended Almighty God in many reſpects, when I might have done otherwiſe. I have not only hid my Talent in a Napkin, I have not only not improv'd that ſtock of grace which God gave me; but, on the contrary, notwithſtanding that, I have been very laborious and abounding in the unfruitful works of darkneſs. I have wilfully grieved the Holy Spirit of God, and many times quenched his good motions in me. Yea, ſo voluntarily and reſolvedly have I done all theſe ſins, that I am perſwaded I could eaſily have choſen, whether I would have committed them or no; no neceſſity at all lay upon me to compel me thereunto, God was faithful and righteous in his promiſes and dealings with me, and my own wicked heart deceiv'd me. And, I think, all of you have been guilty in ſome meaſure of betraying and ſurrendring the abilities which God has beſtowed on you, though I dare not charge you ſo deeply as my ſelf.

14. Now that we have heard, who may be ſaid to be able to reſiſt a Temptation or not: For my more diſtinct proceeding in the confirmation of St. *Paul*'s Propoſition in my Text, I will take our Saviour's counſel, I will *ſit down and examin, whether he that hath but ten thouſand, be able to meet with him which cometh againſt him with twenty thouſand.* Here are two Enemies Camps, and no doubt great Forces on both ſides: But without queſtion, diſproportionable: It concerns me therefore now, by taking a ſurvey and muſter of each, to demonſtrate, that in all reſpects the advantage lies on our ſide. I mentioned before, briefly, that we had three eſpecial Enemies to deal with, the Devil, the World, and the Fleſh: We will proceed in this order againſt them, in the firſt place examining the

Devil's

Devil's power, and the forces we have to oppoſe againſt him.

15. There are many terrible names, I confeſs, by which the Devil is deſcribed in Holy Writ, He is called *Abaddon*, and Ἀπολλύων, *the Deſtroyer*, as one whoſe imployment it were to counter-work againſt God; who calls himſelf *the Saviour and preſerver of all men*; He is call'd a *ramping and a roaring Lyon, that runs about ſeeking whom he may devour*; He is call'd *the great Dragon, the old Serpent, the Devil, and Sathan, which deceiveth the whole world.* (All this in one verſe.) He is call'd *the Red fiery Dragon.* There are extant a great many more hideous pictures of him in Gods Word: But theſe will ſerve our turn ſufficiently, to ſhew how dangerous an Enemy we have, and therefore how great onght to be our reſolution and wiſdom in encountring with him: And leaſt we ſhould think, that ſince he is named in the fore-cited places in the ſingular number, that therefore there is but one Lyon, and but one fiery Dragon to deal with all mankind, and thereupon begin to be a little more ſecure; ſince we ſhould have hard fortune, if it ſhould light upon us to be ſingled out by him, out of ſo infinite a crowd as the world is. No, God knows, it is ſo farr from that, that there is an unutterable number of them, ſuch an infinite vaſt Army, that one whole Legion (which are near about 4000) were at leiſure to poſſeſs one man; And St. *Paul* tells us, *We wreſtle not againſt fleſh and blood*, as if he ſhould ſay; Theſe worldly Enemies are ſo weak and deſpicable, in compariſon of thoſe we are to meet withal, that they are not to be reckoned of: But, ſays he, *We wreſtle againſt Principalities and Powers*, (There are, it ſeems, many Principalities and Powers) *againſt the Rulers of the darkneſs of this world, againſt ſpiritual wickedneſſes in high places*, (the word is) *in heavenly places.*

Apocal. 12. 9.

Epheſ. 6. 12.

16. Now, What have we to oppoſe againſt ſuch an innumerable multitude of Spirits, whereof each particular for his exceſſive ſtrength is called *a Lion*; for his fierceneſs, a *Dragon*; for his poyſonous malice, *a Red Dragon*; for the extream intenſeneſs of that poyſonous malice, *a Red fiery Dragon*; and for his wiſdom and cuuning to make uſe of this ſtrength, fierceneſs, and malice, he is called *the old Serpent*; one that has been a Serpent continually ſpirting out his poyſon againſt us, within very few dayes ſince any crearure was; and therefore, if at the firſt, by his own natural wit, he was able, upon even terms, to overcome *Adam*, then innocent, and therefore not apt to betray himſelf, as we are, What may we conceive of him now after above 5000 years experience: I ſay, What ſhall we who are ready to fall into a ſound, if we ſee but an apparition of one of them, though he do us no harm, How are we likely, think you, to behave our ſelves in combat againſt ſo many thouſands of them?

17. Why truly, God be thanked, notwithſtanding all this, we may do well enough. For we have ſpiritual Armies on our ſide too, that are able to contend with all theſe, and overcome them in all theſe advantages which they have againſt us. Are they many? *Michael* and his Angels are more certainly; Which to me is evident by that ſaying in *Daniel*, where it is made an expreſſion of Gods Glory and Majeſty; His innumerable multitude of attendants, the words are, *Thouſand thouſands miniſter unto him, and ten thouſand times ten thouſand ſtand before him*;

Dan. 7. 10.

which

which ſurely, God would not have made choice of as fit language to expreſs his Power and Glory, if the Devil had been able to contend with God, I, and out-vye him too in this Article: Again, Are they ſtrong? Theſe ſure are ſtronger: for we read of one that ſlew an hundred fourſcore and five thouſand Souldiers in one night: We never heard of ſuch an exploit of the Devils. Are they malicious againſt us? Theſe are more loving and careful to do us good. And certainly, as God is ſtronger than the Devil, ſo likewiſe exceſſive goodneſs in the Angels will eaſily prevail againſt extream malice in the Devil. Now, it is the nature of Love, to be willing to take any pains for the good of the perſon beloved: whereupon St. *Paul*, in that moſt divine deſcription
1 Theſſ. 1. 3. of the three Cardinal Chriſtian Vertues, thus expreſſeth them: *Remembring your work of Faith, and labour of Love, and patience of Hope in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* I confeſs, it is the nature of Malice too to be very laborious and obſervant of all advantages againſt the ſubject Hated: But this muſt needs be granted, that Love will conquer Malice in the ſame degree.

18. Thus, you ſee, we are reaſonably well befriended and back'd by theſe our Auxiliary Forces of our Guardian Angels, ſo, that we need not be diſheartned, if we had no more: But beyond all theſe, we have Almighty God to our friend, whoſe power is ſo unlimitted, that without any ſtraining of Himſelf, without the bending of his Bow, and drawing his Sword, only with unclaſping his hand, *Subſtractione Manutenentiæ*, with meer letting hold go, all creatures in Heaven and Earth, would re-
Pſal. 84. 11. turn to nothing. He is in the language of the Pſalmiſt, *a Sun and a Shield*, that is, in the phraſe of another Pſalm, *a Light and Defence*; *a Sun* to diſcover unto us the ſecret ambuſhes and practiſes of our Enemies, and *a Shield* to protect us from their open force and violence.

Obj. 19. I (will ſome man ſay) there is no man can make any queſtion of God's Power; But the difficulty is, How we ſhould be ſure of his good will: If that were but once procured, the Battel were as good as at an
Sol. end: Why, for that we muſt have recourſe to Gods Word, there it is that we muſt find upon what terms buſineſſes ſtand between him and us. And there certainly, we ſhall find words, which at the firſt ſight to any ordinary reaſonable man would ſeem to make much for us: There are Invitations to a League with him: deſires and requeſts as paſſionate as (I think) ever Poet ſtrain'd for: There are Promiſes which look as if they were ſerious and unfeigned, they are confirm'd with Vows and ſolemn Oaths of ſincerity, and all theſe ſeemingly directed to every one of us. What can we deſire any more, eſpecially from Almighty God, who ſtands in no need of our favour, and therefore is not likely to beſpeak our good opinions of him with diſſembling and lies.

Obj. 20. Oh, but it is the eaſieſt matter in the world for a man with a School-Subtilty, by an Almighty diſtinction to cut off any mans right of Entail to thoſe Promiſes; to appropriate them only to our own friends, to ſome
Sol. two or three that he is pleaſed to favour: I would to God, that men would but conſider what end, what project, Almighty God ſhould have in making his poor creatures believe he means well to them, when there is no ſuch matter: *Would any of you*, ſaith our Saviour, *when his Son ſhall*

ask

ask him bread, give him a ſtone; *or inſtead of a fiſh* to nouriſh him, *a ſerpent* to deſtroy him? *If then you (which are evil) know how to give good gifts*,; If you would not have the heart to mock poor children after this manner; How much rather would not God? For Gods ſake therefore let there be but as much ſincerity, as much good nature in Almighty God (I will not ſay as in your ſelves, for it may be that would be too much for you to grant, but) as our Saviour confeſſeth, that there were in the Jews that crucified him; And then we all of us have right enough to his promiſes; we ſhall have no reaſon to doubt of his good intention to help and aſſiſt us ſo far, that unleſs we delight in deſtruction, unleſs we will turn fugitives, unleſs we will fight on our enemies ſide; All the Devils in Hell ſhall not be able to prevail againſt us. And thus much of the firſt ſquadrons, *Michael* and his Angels oppoſed to the Devil and his Angels.

21. The ſecond enemy which we profeſſed hoſtility againſt in our Baptiſm, was the vain temptations of this world: And ſo forcible and prevailing are the temptations thereof; that the Devil (who for his powerful managing of this weapon is called *the God of this world*) in his Encounter with our Saviour, ſet up his reſt upon it as ſuppoſing if this would not ſerve his turn, there were no more fighting for him; *All this will I give thee*, ſaid he. And ſuch a value he ſet upon this ſtake, that no leſs than the extremeſt degree of horrible Idolatry could ſerve his turn to oppoſe againſt it; *All this will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worſhip me.* And when he ſaw that this proffer would not be accepted, he preſently quits the field, deſpairing utterly of any ſucceſs. The more dangerous indeed is this enemy, I may ſay, more dangerous to us than the Devil himſelf; becauſe we all acknowledge the Devil in perſon to be our enemy; and therefore not one of us will be beholding to him for any thing, if he bring us the gift himſelf; a ſick man would not be healed by him, nor a poor man made rich, but ſcarce one among a thouſand has that opinion of the vain pomps and ſinful pleaſures of the world. Our enemy! No certainly, It is the beſt and moſt comforting friend we have in this life; all our thoughts are taken up with it, it poſſeſſeth us at all times, we dream of it ſleeping, and purſue it waking; And yet our Saviour ſaith, *Ye cannot ſerve God and Mammon.* And again, *How can ye believe, who ſeek honour one of another*: And again, *If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* What ſtrength then have we to oppoſe this enemy?

22. Why, ſurely that which would ſuffice but an ordinary, reaſonable man, and might ſerve any of us, but that we will needs be unreaſonable only in things which concern our everlaſting welfare: And that is the conſideration of thoſe unſpeakable joyes which ſhall attend thoſe who can deſpiſe the unſatisfying vain pleaſures of this life. A Philoſopher, which but reading *Plato*'s Poetical deſcription of the ſerenity of that life, which a vertuous ſoul (delivered from the Priſon of the body) lives, was ſo far tranſported with the conceit of it, though for ought he knew, there was no ſuch thing indeed; or if there were, perhaps never intended for him, that he becomes preſently weary of this priſon, and by a violent

death frees himſelf from it; and God only knows what a change he found. Whereas we have Gods word for the certainty of that glorious life which his ſervants ſhall live; yea, a great deal of pains he hath taken, to make it deſirable and amiable unto us, by ranſacking all the treaſures of this world, the moſt coſtly jewels, the moſt precious metals, to embelliſh the deſcription thereof with all. We have beſides the experience of ſeveral men, who have ſeen and taſted as much of that glory, as a mortal creature is capable of; S. *Paul*, and S. *John* the Divine. Surely, the conſideration hereof might ſerve our turn, if not quite to diſreliſh unto us, and even to make us hate the vain pleaſures of this world, yet, at leaſt, not to prefer them when they come in competition with the other: And I would to God we would ſuffer them but ſo far to prevail upon us. But I cannot ſtay.

23. I have rank'd the three Armies of our enemies juſt after the Roman faſhion, reſerving the Triaries, the old experienced Souldiers to the laſt. For though in ſhew, the firſt rank of the Devils appear moſt terrible; yet in very deed, all their power is nothing, unleſs the luſts of our hearts take part with them, and give them advantage againſt us. The luſts of the fleſh, are thoſe Traytors which continually keep us company, we cannot be quit of them; without the Devils aſſiſtance, they are able to captive us; what, think you, then are they able to do, being manag'd by ſo powerful, ſo wiſe an enemy? without them, all the power of Hell and darkneſs are inſufficient to withdraw us from our obedience, and, by conſequence, from the love and favour of God. For, ſuppoſe the Devil (for example) preſent a luſtful object to our fancy, as it were holding a laſcivious picture before our eyes; if we conſent not in our minds, to any baſe delight in ſuch a ſpectacle; if we ſettle not our thoughts upon it, as upon a pleaſing ſight; it will be ſo far from doing us any harm, that it will rather prove a means to root us more deeply in the favour of God, as perſons unwilling to take Pay of his and our enemies.

24. But alas, as we are ordinarily ſo far from this nobleneſs of mind, from this bravery of a Chriſtian-like Spirit; that, as if the Devil were too ſlow to object ſuch Temptations to us, we will not await his leiſure; but on all occaſions be ready and deſirous to raiſe up, and then ſettle ſuch unworthy thoughts in our minds; we will be content to ſpend many hours ſometimes in the acting of this inward contemplative Adultery. S. *Paul*, ſpeaking of thoſe luſts of our fleſh, calls them our mem-
Col. 3. 5. bers, when he ſaith, *Mortifie your members which are on earth; fornication, uncleanneſs, inordinate affection, evil concupiſcence, &c.* And indeed we, by our practiſe, make good the Apoſtles expreſſion; For we account our ſelves as lame unperfect creatures without them; we know not what to do with our ſelves, eſpecially when we are alone, unleſs we ſet our ſelves on work this way, by acting to our ſelves ſuch filthy ſins, which perhaps natural baſhfulneſs, want of money or opportunity, will not ſuffer us to put in practiſe. What ſtrength have we now to oppoſe to theſe moſt pernicious enemies, which are ſo cloſely cemented, and even incorporated within us, that they are become as it were fleſh of our fleſh, and bones of our bones?

25. Why

25. Why ſurely, as naturally we have received this root of Bitterneſs in our hearts, which is apt to give an infectious tincture to all the thoughts and actions iſſuing from thence. So likewiſe it hath pleaſed Almighty God to imprint a new Principle in our minds, to plant as it were a new Spirit in our ſouls; I mean, that active powerful Grace, which without any co-operation of our own, he infuſes into us eſpecially, in our Baptiſm; and which is afterward, ἀνακαινούμενον, ſtrengthened and enlivened daily, by a conſtant frequent exerciſing our ſelves in the uſe of thoſe manifold bleſſed means of our ſalvation, the hearing, reading, and meditating on his holy Word, and participation of his heavenly myſteries. For ſurely, if Reaſon alone (by the help of thoſe worthy grave precepts which are extant in the Treatiſes of Moral Philoſophy) hath been able to change many men from the habitual practiſe of ſeveral vices to a vertuous (I had like to have ſaid alſo a Religious) life; why ſhould any man think ſo meanly of God's holy Word and Sacraments, as to doubt but that much rather they ſhould be able to make us *new creatures, to make us wiſe unto ſalvation*, eſpecially conſidering that continual aſſiſtance of Gods Holy Spirit which infallibly attends the uſe and exerciſe of thoſe his bleſſed means. Do you think God is ſo favourable to the Devil or his inſtruments, (our luſts) that he is unwilling to have them ſubdued and mortified in us? And, if he be not unwilling, ſurely much leſs is he unable to perform this great work in us, even to the end.

26. Therefore, as before, ſpeaking of thoſe outward forces, God and his holy Angels, which are ready to take our parts, and fight on our ſides againſt the Devil, and his Angels, we apply'd that ſaying of *Eliſha* to his ſervant, If thine eyes were opened, thou ſhouldeſt perceive, *that they which are with us, are more then they which are againſt us.* So likewiſe in the Caſe in hand, we may make uſe of that ſaying of S. *John*, *Greater is he which is in you, than he which is in the world*: implying, that God is uot only in himſelf ſtronger than the Devil, but alſo as conſidered *in us*, *i.e.* as working in our hearts by his Grace; This way, I ſay, he is ſtronger than the Devil; His Spirit co-operating with the means of our ſalvation, is more vigorous and powerfuul to reuew us unto the Image of his Holineſs; if we will but do that which lies in our own power, then the Devil (though taking his advantage of that concupiſcence, which in ſome meaſure is continually reſident in us) is or can be to corrupt, and ſo to deſtroy us. For his power is not conſiderable, unleſs we be willing to joyn with him. Thus you ſee, though our enemies be allowed all the advantages, they can challenge, yet in exact eſteem, without any flattering of our ſelves, we may conclude, that they who are ready, and deſirons to joyn forces with us, are greater, in all reſpects, than they which are againſt us. 1 Joh. 4. 4.

27. But yet for all this, ſince the conducting and managing of thoſe forces, is left to our diſcretion; for God will not fight ſingle againſt the Devil in our behalf, unleſs we lend him our aid and aſſiſtance: And therefore, *Curſe ye Meroz, ſaith the Angel of the Lord* (in the Victorious Song of *Deborah*) *curſe bitterly the inhabitants thereof.* And why muſt poor *Meroz* be ſo bitterly curſed? *Becauſe they came not to the help* Judg. 5. 23.

of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the Mighty. Hereupon it may ſeem, that Almighty God will not put to his ſtrength in our defence; unleſs we joyn with him; He will not be our Champion to fight, whileſt we ſit ſtill, only ſpectators of the combat. And therefore this conſideration alone may be ſufficient to abate that confidence, which the foregoing diſcourſe, might be apt to raiſe in us, eſpecially if we be not utter ſtrangers to our ſelves, if we be not ignorant of our own weakneſs.

28. For ſatisfaction therefore to this diſcouragement, I will now endeavour to demonſtrate by proofs drawn from undeniable Reaſon, and experience, That there is no ſinful Temptation ſo ſtrong, but that an ordinary Chriſtian may (by the aſſiſtance before mentioned) eaſily conquer it. And leſt my proceeding herein may lye open to any manner of exception; let me chooſe from among you the weakeſt, moſt unexperienc'd Chriſtian, I dare oppoſe this man againſt the ſharpeſt and moſt furious Temptation; and will make him confeſs, that though he be (*de facto*) ſubdued by it, yet that that came to paſs meerly by his own voluntary and affected unwatchfulneſs and cowardiſe, and that it was truly in very deed, in his power to have reſiſted it. I will make choice to inſtance in the ſin of uncleanneſs and fornication; a ſin, that generally finds ſuch excuſe and patronage in the world; becauſe it is ſuppoſed to be ſo naturally born and bred up with us, that there is no ſhaking it off; it is a ſin ſo reſolved upon to be unconquerable, that few men go about to reſtrain it. The ancient Antidotes againſt this ſin, Watching and Faſting, are grown out of uſe with us, we conclude they will do us little good againſt this hereditary evil, and therefore the beſt is to give them clean over.

29. Yet I ſay, let me ſuppoſe an ordinary Chriſtian, environed with all the ſtrongeſt temptations to this ſo natural, and therefore concluded ſo excuſable a ſin; let him have the moſt charming beauty, that has the moſt artificial waies of ſollicitation, together with opportunity, and all circumſtances which are not fit to be ſuppoſed here; yet for all this, if that man ſhould ſay he is not able to reſiſt ſuch a temptation, he lies againſt his own ſoul: For if at that inſtant, a ſudden meſſage ſhould interrupt him, a threatning of Death, if he did not free himſelf from the danger of her filthy embraces, would he not do it? I deſire only that each one of you in his heart would anſwer for him. Then it is clear, he is able to reſiſt this pretended irreſiſtable temptation: And why ſhould not the conſideration of the danger of eternal Torments be as perſwaſive againſt any ſin, as the fear of a momentany death? But I will not make my advantage of ſo frightful an enemy to his pleaſure, as Death. Suppoſe in all thoſe circumſtances before mentioned, a good ſum of money were but offered him, upon condition he would abſtain but that time from the execution of his filthy luſt: I doubt not at all, but that upon theſe terms he would find ſtrength enough to conquer this Temptation. Shall Satan then be able to caſt out Satan, and ſhall not God much more do it? Shall one ſin be able to deſtroy the exerciſe of another, and ſhall not Grace much rather?

30. Beſides

30. Besides, if we believe that generally it is not in our power to resist any of these temptations; How dare you who are Fathers, suffer your Daughters after they are come to years, to live unmarried? How dare you expose their souls to such dangers, unless you think, that ordinarily any man or woman is able to resist the Temptations of the flesh? How dare you who are Merchants, for the hope of a little gain, live in foreign Countreys as if you were divorc'd from your wives; if you religiously think, that were it not for the benefit of marriage, they could not ordinarily be honest?

31. Lastly, you may remember that our Saviour (in his descriptions of Hell) seldome leaves out this phrase, *where the worm dieth not:* which worm is generall by interpreters moraliz'd into the sting of conscience, *i.e.* a continual vexation of soul in the Reprobates, caused by the consideration, how it was meerly their own fault, their wilful folly, which brought them to that misery. Now this worm would dye, and be quite extinguish'd in them, if they were of some mens opinions; that the reason why they sinn'd, was not because they would sin, but because they could not choose but do it, because they wanted power to resist all the temptations which were objected to them. Such a conceit may serve indeed to vex them, but it is not possible it should trouble their conscience; For by this Reason, *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, might with as good reason be tormented in conscience for falling into Hell, when the earth opened under them, as for their sin of Rebellion against *Moses*; If the Reason why they committed that sin, was the subtraction of Divine Grace and assistance, without which it was impossible for them not to be Rebels. But indeed, why should Almighty God withdraw his Grace from any man? Because (say some) by falling, they may experimentally learn their own weakness without his assistance; and so be discouraged from trusting or relying upon themselves. A strange Reason no doubt: For as long as they have the Grace of God, they will not relye upon themselves; and when they are destitute of his Grace, they cannot relie upon him: so that it seems, God takes away his Grace from a man for this end, that wanting it, he may sin; and by that means, when he has got that grace again, he may perceive, that when he is destitute of Gods grace, he cannot choose but sin; which was a thing which he knew at the first without all this adoe. But there may be a better Reason given, why God should take away his Grace from a man; and that is, because he negligently omits to make his best use of it, and so deserves that punishment. But this Reason will satisfie as little as the former: For suppose (for example) a man at this instant in the state of Grace, and so in the favour of God. Upon these grounds, it is impossible that this man should ever sin; For surely God will not undeservedly take away his Grace from him, till he merit that puishment by his Sin; and till God take away his Grace from him, he cannot sin; therefore he must never sin. But this discourse, though it meerly concern Practise, looks so like a Controversie, that I am weary of it.

Obj.

Sol.

Obj.

Sol.

32. We are apt enough to slander God with too much mercy sometimes, as if he bore us so particular an affection, that notwithstanding our never so many sins, yet he will still be merciful unto us. Oh that we

could conceive of his mercy and goodneſs aright! as rather willing to prevent our ſins by giving us ſufficient preſervatives againſt the commiting them. I would to God, that inſtead of making ſubtil-ſcholaſtical diſputes of the power and efficacy of Gods Grace, we would magnifie the force thereof, by ſuffering it to exerciſe its ſway in our lives and converſation; we ſhould then eaſily find, that *we are able to do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengtheneth us.*

Errata's in the Sermons

PAg. 4. *lin.* 3. *for* your mouth, *read* his mouth: *p.* 5. *l.* 15. *f.* ſludiply, *r.* ſtupidly: *p.* 19. *l.* 14. *f.* were, *r.* where: *p.* 28. *l.* 12. *f.* you, every, *r.* you, and every: *p.* 43. *l.* 42. *f.* any, *r.* nay: *p.* 45. *l.* 43. *f.* counnance, *r.* conntenance: *l.* 45, 46. *f.* words Chriſt, *r.* words of Chriſt: *p.* 49. *l.* 49. *f.* much, *r.* muſt: *p.* 58. *l.* 8. *f.* it almoſt, *r.* it is almoſt: *p.* 102. *l.* 41. *f.* behavicur this, *r.* behaviour in this: *p.* 103. *l.* 33. *f.* thas, *r.* thar.

A Table of the Texts of the foregoing SERMONS.

SERMON I. on 2 TIM. III. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

THis know alſo, that in the laſt daies perilous times ſhall come. For men ſhall be lovers of their own ſelves, covetous, boaſters, proud, blaſphemers, diſobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, truce-breakers, falſe accuſers, incontinent, fierce, deſpiſers of thoſe that are good, Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleaſures more than lovers of God; Having a form of Godlineſs, but denying the power thereof. Pag. 1.

SERMON II. III. on PSAL. XIV. 1.

The Fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God. P. 19, & 35

SERMON IV. on LUKE IX. 23.

—— *Let him deny himſelf.* P. 49

SERMON V. on ROM. VIII. 34.

Who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that died, yea rather that is riſen again —— P. 63

SERMON VI. on LUKE XVI. 9.

Make to your ſelves friends of the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs, that when you fail, they may receive you into everlaſting habitations. P. 81

SERMON VII. on LUKE XIX. 8.

—— *And if I have defrauded any man by forged cavillation, I reſtore unto him four fold.* P. 97

SERMON VIII. GAL. V. 5.

For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of Righteouſneſs by Faith. P. 112

SERMON IX. on 1 COR. X. 13.

—— *God is Faithful, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that ye are able* —— P. 137

FINIS.